

Immigrant Incorporation in the U.S. and Mexico:
Well-being, Community Reception, and National Identity in Contexts of Reception and
Return
by
Dulce Medina

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved April 2016 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Cecilia Menjívar, Co-Chair
Jennifer Glick, Co-Chair
Nathan Martin

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2016

© 2016 Dulce Medina

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

This dissertation focuses on the incorporation of twenty first century mixed-status families, living in Phoenix, Arizona and Central Mexico. Using a combination of research methods, chapters illustrate patterns of immigrant incorporation by focusing on well-being, community reception, and national identity. First, results of mixed-method data collected in Phoenix, Arizona from 2009-2010 suggest that life satisfaction varies by integration scores, a holistic measure of how immigrants are integrating into their communities by accounting for individual, household, and contextual factors. Second, findings from qualitative data collected in Mexico during 2010, illustrate that communities receive parents and children differently. Third, a continued analysis of qualitative 2010 data from Mexico, exhibits that both parents and children identify more with the U.S. than with Mexico, regardless of where they were born. Together these chapters contribute to broad concepts of assimilation, well-being, community reception, and national identity.

DEDICATION

To my family and those affected by borders.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my committee, Cecilia Menjívar, Jennifer Glick, and Nathan Martin who have offered their guidance, support, and encouragement throughout my graduate school career. Dr. Menjívar, thank you for mentoring me and allowing me to shadow your analytical thought and writing process, so that I could refine my own writing. Dr. Glick, words cannot express your generous support and mentorship early on into this return migration project, the research assistantships you offered me, and for your many pieces of advice along the way. Dr. Martin, thank you for your flexibility, recommendations, and reassurance that was on the right path throughout my drafts. Next, I am thankful for the U.S. and Mexico-based families who opened up their homes and shared their migration stories with me. The same goes for the Mexico non-profit organization that offered their support, a quiet place to work, and useful on-the ground knowledge of my research site. I also give acknowledgement to my parents and siblings who have encouraged and fostered my academic aspirations. I am appreciative for friends and colleagues that proofread my work and cheered me on throughout the process. I want to especially thank my partner Alan Moreno for joining me in Arizona for this academic journey. And last, Sebastián Moreno for providing me with an extra reason to finish.

I also want to express gratitude to Dr. Szkupinski Quiroga for her mentorship support early on when I was preparing to collect data in Mexico and the South Phoenix Collaborative project for allowing me to utilize the data for the U.S.-based chapter in this dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	vii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 IMMIGRANT INTEGRATION AND LIFE SATISFACTION IN ARIZONA ...	16
3 RECEPTION VARIABILITY FOR MIXED-NATIVITY FAMILIES	50
4 NATIONAL IDENTITY POST RETURN MIGRATION	82
5 CONCLUSIONS	104
REFERENCES.....	1
APPENDIX	
A INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW FORMS	19
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.....	31

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Descriptive Statistics and Measurement Notes.	35
2. Sample Characteristics	63

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Mixed Methods Analysis	36

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation focuses on how twenty-first century, mixed-status families -- meaning families with at least one parent without legal status and at least one U.S. citizen child (Fix and Zimmermann 1999) -- living in Phoenix, Arizona and Central Mexico incorporate into their contexts of reception and return. Contexts of return, are defined as places that are shaped by U.S. immigration policies but beyond actual borders of the U.S. (Medina and Menjívar 2015), whereas contexts of reception are described as interacting elements between structures that shape immigrant outcomes (Portes and Rumbaut 2001).

Mixed-status families are growing in large proportions in both countries, and the experiences of these families are a barometer of current contexts and international challenges on the forefront. Latinos are the fastest growing minority group in the U.S. (Census 2013), and since is quite common for families in the U.S. to possess multiple legal statuses or be mixed-status (Fix and Zimmermann 1999) it is extremely important to understand how anti-immigrant policies affect more than those whom the laws single out (Leary and Sanchez 2008). Further, Mexico now braces for immigration challenges as the number of foreigners continues to rise, due in large part to entire families migrating from the U.S. to Mexico as a result of tightening U.S. immigration policies. The Mexican Census estimates that one million children from the U.S. now live in Mexico (INEGI n.d.), and these numbers are expected to increase as the U.S. immigration

enforcement continues, since many return to be reunited with their families (Pew Research Center 2015).¹

Analyzing immigrants in the U.S. and Mexico is beneficial because of the ongoing and historical large-scale Mexican migration to the U.S. due to labor demands and political unrest (Jie Zong and Batalova 2014). Comparing experiences in both countries separately but during the same timeframe allows me to illustrate how anti-immigrant landscapes contour how members of mixed-status families perceive their well-being, are received by their communities, and make sense of their national identities. Overall, this allows us to understand how immigrants, and children in particular, are able to incorporate across these two settings.

Today's U.S. foreigners are dissimilar to previous waves of immigration (Jiménez 2011) and vary in their settlement patterns (Balassiano and Maldonado 2013). Growing anti-immigrant legislation and deportations (Felix 2013; Flores 2014; Schwartz et al. 2014) make it important to understand how immigrants are faring in the U.S. and in Mexico where they are largely re-migrating to (INEGI 2010).

In a recent article, Suárez-Orozco et al. (2011) utilize an ecological framework to highlight the developmental implications of unauthorized status. The ecological framework argues that reciprocal actions unfold within individuals and their environments, which vary by context, culture, and time. These interactions take place within a nested system comprised of immediate environments (microsystems),

¹ A recent announcement by the Department of Homeland Security indicates that increased focus will be placed on integrating undocumented immigrants rather than deporting them. However, it is still too early to speculate on how and when this approach may be implemented. The uncertainty surrounding U.S. immigration policy exacerbates immigrants' vulnerability, as some remain in immigration detention, children and parents are torn apart, and states attempt to implement their own immigration policies

mesosystems (interrelations), exosystems (community level) and macrosystems (societal, policy, and cultural belief systems) (Bronfenbrenner and Morris 2006). As Suárez-Orozco et al. (2011) argue, contextual factors constrain and negatively influence the outcomes of children and youth of undocumented.

In this dissertation, I extend Suárez-Orozco's work by arguing that belonging to a mixed-status family (a bi-product of nation-state policies) also shapes individual and community level incorporation experiences. I utilize this theoretical approach because it considers multiple layers of society and the interactions between them. While most studies focus on the outcomes of immigrants on one layer or society, using an ecological framework works best when there are multiple outcomes to review and individuals and contexts simultaneously shape one another. Additionally, the ecological framework accounts for time, which allows for a nuanced view of incorporation. Although this framework has frequently been utilized to tie how parental interactions shape child behavior or development, this dissertation adds to the ecological research by analyzing how policies on a macro level, shapes how immigrants incorporate on the mesosystems and exosystems and the interactions between these three layers. In the following sections, I describe two macrosystems: a) the U.S. as a receiving context, and b) Mexico as a context of return, as they pertain to mixed-status families.

Receiving Context: Mixed-Status Families in the U.S.

As recently as 2010, an estimated 9 million people lived in mixed-status families in the U.S. (Taylor et al. 2011)=. Mixed-status family units can be comprised of legal, unauthorized, or permanent residents (Fix and Zimmermann 1999). Others exist in “liminal legality” (Menjívar 2006), a gray zone, as they wait for their immigration

interview date. Multiple legal statuses can complicate relationships within the family (Foner and Dreby 2011). U.S.-born children can access government services that undocumented children cannot, which can make undocumented children resentful towards their siblings (Menjívar and Abrego 2009). The deportability of one parent is the ever-present possibility of mixed-status families (Dreby 2012; Suárez-Orozco et al. 2011), and current deportation policies will affect millions of children living in the U.S. (Dreby 2012). Citizenship is one way undocumented parents envision they can ensure their safety, but even then, it does not change their social interactions and formal political procedures because of their perceived “illegality” (Felix 2013).

In hostile and precarious contexts such as Arizona, law enforcement practices place mixed-status families at risk by their discretionary stops, intimidation, restriction, stereotyping reinforcement, and unfair and impartial treatment before the law (Romero 2013; Yoshikawa 2011). Over the years, anti-immigration legislation has been proposed and passed, including Senate Bill 1070 (SB1070), a law which requires police to determine legal status when someone is arrested or detained when there is reasonable suspicion that the person is undocumented (ACLU 2016). Cultural activities, such as listening to Spanish music and shopping in certain locations, as well as class activities, such as utilizing bikes or public transportation, place individuals at risk for police stops. During these stops, undocumented legal status is assumed regardless of actual citizenship or immigrant status (Romero 2013). In a recent study, it was found that even documented individuals experienced high levels of psychological distress due to SB1070 (Quiroga, Medina, and Glick 2014). Most respondents expressed concern for their family and friends as a result of increased immigration attention. This mirrors other findings

regarding the spillover effects that takes place when policies disadvantage noncitizen members but carry over to citizen children (Fix and Zimmermann 1999). Broader ramifications are also expected in Arizona communities as a result of restricting undocumented immigrants (Leary and Sanchez 2008).

Context of Return: Mexico's Returning Migrants with U.S.-Born Children

Migrants often return to their homelands for multiple reasons ranging from family factors to deportation (Arce, Alfaro, and Mora 2012; Garcia Zamora and Elena 2014; Medina and Menjívar 2015). In the case of Mexico, nationals are returning to their home country after forming families and having children in the U.S. They are also returning to reunify with their families (Pew Research Center 2015). Return migrants are typically defined as those who return to their homeland to resettle (Gmelch 1980), after a stay abroad for more than five years (INEGI n.d.).

The *context of return* concept offers a lens to assist in explaining contemporary return migration incorporation experiences. A context of return refers to the experiences that are shaped by legal and economic influences in the U.S. (Medina and Menjívar 2015). Even though these families physically reside outside of the U.S., their blended status continues to set conditions to their existence. Mexico's own foreigner laws, which some scholars argue are the blueprints of the U.S.'s policies (Gonzalez-Murphy and Koslowski 2011), directly contribute to the incorporation challenges these families encounter. For example, U.S.-born children in blended families face legal challenges in Mexico because they are foreigners (Medina and Menjívar 2015). For example, U.S.-born children must obtain a Clave Única de Registro de Población (CURP) in order to register for public services like education. Therefore, the burden of possessing proper

immigration related documentation parallels what their parents experienced in the U.S. except in reverse.

Although most of the literature on contexts of return focuses on children's public incorporation via school enrollment, these studies provide a general depiction of what mixed-status families are facing. Among school-enrolled children in Mexico, Vargas-Valle (2015) finds that while U.S.-born children live with one or both parents in Mexico, it is often the child's first time in their parents' country of origin. Although the children are technically not returnees, the field identifies these children as such (Gonzalez and Zúñiga 2014; Medina and Menjívar 2015; Valdez-Gardea 2012; Valle 2015). It is important to understand that U.S.-born children are in Mexico without a choice and without a voice, so their options are limited under these circumstances. Their parent's decisions, assets (Arce et al. 2012), social capital (Valle 2015), and other statuses influence their integration in Mexico, as a context of return.

Context Comparisons

In this section, I compare and contrast the U.S. as a context of reception and Mexico as a context of return. First, the U.S. is a traditional migrant destination whereas Mexico is usually seen as a return site, or a context of return (Medina and Menjívar 2015). The U.S. can still be considered a context of reception by the sheer numbers of migrants continuously entering the U.S. despite caging effects because of U.S. immigration policies (Massey, Durand, and Pren 2014). If the U.S.-born children were analyzed separately from their parents, they would be classified as foreigners or immigrants in Mexico, and that could entail viewing Mexico as a new context of reception.

Besides sharing flows of migrants, the U.S. and Mexico also share parallel views regarding migrants and have similar enforcement policies. Both have the legal language to identify residents and foreigners (i.e., ‘aliens’ in the U.S., and ‘*extranjeros*’ in Mexico), enforcement policies and street-level bureaucrats (Medina and Menjívar 2015), and anti-immigrant sentiments. While anti-immigrant sentiments are notable in the U.S., discrimination is less talked about and selective in Mexico. In fact, skin color and class origin work in conjunction to reproduce social inequalities (Flores and Telles 2012). Indigenous discrimination is also prevalent. Furthermore, color discrimination in Mexico resembles the racial inequalities found in the U.S. In this sense, the ideologies of these two countries are strong examples of latent effects of colonialism.

To understand how mixed-status families maneuver the legal regimes of both countries and how these laws affect their incorporation, I analyze cases of families in Phoenix, Arizona where the infamous SB1070 was enacted (Chapter 2) and in central Mexico where contemporary mixed-status families are relocating (Chapters 3 & 4). These two sites are chosen because of their mirroring anti-immigrant laws and because they have large numbers of Mexican and U.S. migrants (Gonzalez-Murphy and Koslowski 2011). Utilizing independent analytical frameworks within each chapter allows for a more focused view of particular sub-topics, yet the social-ecological framework complements and joins the sections. In the following sections, I elaborate on the chapters’ respective integration, return migration, and cultural citizenship literature.

LITERATURE

Since each of the chapters of this dissertation focuses on how immigrants maneuver hostile contexts of reception and return, I synthesize the literature pertaining to

assimilation, return migration, and cultural citizenship in the following sections. The first section focuses on assimilation and integration scholarship in general because it represents all levels of the ecological framework's nested system. The second section highlights literature on return migration and social integration to represent the exosystems (community level). The third section focuses on national identity on the individual level, or microsystem.

Assimilation and integration literature

To highlight the integration process and its role in life satisfaction, I rely on assimilation and integration literature. When individuals migrate, a natural process occurs between newcomers and the host society. This acclimation or “assimilation” process, is a classical framework and refers to a straight-line convergence, one in which immigrants become similar in norms, values, behaviors, and characteristics of the host society (Brown and Bean 2006). The assimilation process begins with the immigrant generation and can take multiple generations, with no fixed timeframe (Brown and Bean 2006). The classical assimilation theory was the predominant U.S. perspective on European immigrant integration in the 20th century (Brown and Bean 2006).² According to Park, assimilation is a “process of interpenetration and fusion by which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons or groups, and, by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated with them in a common cultural life” (Park and Burgess 1921, p. 360). This race-relations cycle consists of four stages: contact and curiosity, competition and conflict, accommodation, and diffusion or assimilation is the final stage.

² However, this dissertation acknowledges that migration has long been a historical fact.

The assimilation framework, however, has been criticized for being ethnocentric and singular (Portes and Böröcz 1989) resulting in the development of incorporation and segmented assimilation (Tran 2012) areas of research. Scholars have also found that when applying the straight-line assimilation perspective to non-European immigrants, there were anomalies in intergenerational assimilation (Zhou 1997). Segmented assimilation is one of the alternative frameworks that helps explain the incorporation experiences of the tens of millions of immigrants that migrated to the U.S. after 1965 (Gans 1992; Tran 2012; Zhou 1997). This framework acknowledges segregation and inequalities and describes three possible immigrant outcomes (Portes and Zhou 1993; Zhou 1997). Unlike straight-line assimilation, segmented assimilation focuses on the interactions between contextual and individual-level factors (Zhou 1997), and explain diverse outcomes through different *modes of incorporation* and contextual factors (Portes and Zhou 1993).

The mode of incorporation is a multi-layer model highlighting the three layers of the context of reception, shaping how immigrants integrate. These layers include: government policies, community reception, and within their co-ethnic community (Portes and Rumbaut 1990; Portes and Zhou 1993). These levels can be hostile, indifferent, or receptive, and within those, they can be prejudiced or non-prejudiced. I apply modes of incorporation framework to mixed-status families to understand how individuals navigate the government policies that are prejudiced in two separate locations. More specifically, how the context plays a role in immigrant individual-level views on their well-being in the U.S., community incorporation in Mexico, and ultimately their national identity.

I argue that it is not sufficient to examine immigrant integration from an individual standpoint, but instead, researchers need to consider the entire family. There is a gap in the literature on how blended legal-status families incorporate simultaneously into contexts of reception and return. Both straight-line and segmented assimilation theories examine generations separately, but we now know that, more often than not, families have blended legal statuses (Fix and Zimmermann 1999; Taylor et al. 2011). Legal status shapes mixed-status family experiences (Menjívar 2011), and anti-immigrant legislation affects entire households rather than just the members the law is intended to target (Leary and Sanchez 2008; Quiroga et al. 2014). Due to the fact that the term “mixed-status” is one that is created by the very laws in both countries, this dissertation provides new insights on linkages between legal status and incorporation by utilizing a social-ecological lens to examine how mixed-status families integrate into the U.S. and Mexico under their specific sets of immigration laws.

Return Migration: Societal Integration

To highlight how mixed-status families re-incorporate into a Mexican community, I rely on return migration and societal integration frameworks. Similar to how immigrants ‘integrate’ into the U.S., when they return to their homeland, they must re-integrate. Return migration is described as the act of emigrants returning to their homeland to resettle (Gmelch 1980). Relative to the literature on immigrant assimilation and integration, return migration remains a neglected area of research (Arce et al. 2012; Arp-Nissen 2004; Black and King 2004; Cassarino 2004; Taylor 2001).

One of the newest categories of return migrants is those who return to their homeland with their U.S.-born children. These are blended families with Mexican

national parents and foreign-born children, some of whom have multiple legal statuses. These families are complex and must navigate through the bureaucracies in Mexico as a direct consequence of leaving the U.S. The return migration literature largely focuses on adults, and very few studies consider entire families or the social integration of returnees. However, the latest data shows that close to one million foreign children are now living in Mexico with at least one parent (INEGI 2010). These families often migrate to Mexico due to a parent's undocumented status and tightening borders. This dissertation extends the scholarship on return migration and children incorporation by focusing on mixed-status families in Mexico who are 'returning' after a stay in the U.S.

Another neglected area of return migration scholarship entails the social integration of returnees. Yet, the concept of return migration involves returning to their former society. During the return migration process, communities respond to their members 'coming home' and dynamic exchanges take place between the individual and society. These exchanges are important to study because they provide insight on the relationships between the community and returnees. They also illuminate how returnees, or, in this case, mixed-status families, perceive their community's reception. One way of analyzing the case of mixed-status families arriving in Mexico and their social integration is by using the aforementioned modes of incorporation lens. This framework allows us to differentiate how the community receives nationals and their foreign children. The contribution is trifold: this dissertation extends scholarship on return migration, social integration, and child incorporation.

National Identity: Cultural Citizenship

To understand how national identity forms when families are impacted by border policies, I utilize a cultural citizenship framework and apply it to mixed-status families in Mexico. Rosaldo (1994) describes cultural citizenship as, “the right to be different and to belong in a participatory democratic sense” (p. 402). Cultural citizenship takes place regardless of differences in race, religion, class, gender and sexual orientation and highlights how minorities claim spaces (Rosaldo 1997). It recognizes that people have different understandings of given situations, and as they make claims to citizenship, they operate within their social position (Rosaldo 1997).

Although the cultural citizenship framework was created for a U.S. context, Mexico is no exception in excluding individuals based on differences. As explained earlier, Mexico’s own foreigner policies create barriers for foreign children to access public services such as a K-8th grade education (Medina and Menjívar 2015). Mexico’s own General Law of Population promotes nationalism and classifies foreigners into categories of non-immigrant and immigrant. A non-immigrant (*no inmigrante*) refers to a foreigner that was temporarily admitted into Mexico and has a permit, whereas an immigrant (*inmigrante*) refers to a foreigner who has the intention of becoming a permanent resident (Gobernacion 1974). These terms can make it problematic for those without legal authorization to feel as though they belong. In the case of mixed-status families, U.S.-born children may feel rejected, a pattern in reverse to what undocumented individuals feel like in the U.S.

In the U.S., “Dreamers,” or Deferred Action Child Arrivals (DACA), are perfect examples of individuals who claim both nationalities. Brought to the U.S. by their parents as children, these youth often identify more with ‘American’ culture than with the

country of their birth. Alternatively, they identify with both U.S. and Mexican culture when they are deported (Solis and Anderson 2012). Due to the fact that the U.S. and Mexico share similar anti-immigration sentiments and contexts of return are products of U.S. immigration policies and economic times, I apply the cultural citizenship framework to mixed-status families in Mexico to analyze and explain their feelings of belonging, or better yet, national identity. Therefore, this dissertation contributes the scholarship on cultural citizenship and national identity.

Chapter Summaries

Chapter two considers how life satisfaction among immigrants in Phoenix, Arizona varies by degree of integration. Phoenix, Arizona is an old destination for Latino immigrants. Arizona's anti-immigrant legal climate shapes immigrants' lives, making Latinos hyperaware of the law in daily activities (Menjívar 2011). It is also the location of SB1070, a policy marker of federal immigration policy shortcomings and state reactions to immigration flows (Menjívar 2013). Since the state passed anti-immigration legislation back in 2004 (Cambell, 2011), a streak of propositions have been passed making proof of citizenship necessary to register to vote or obtain state benefits. These propositions have also implemented employer sanctions for hiring those without legal status. Other state propositions limited immigrants' access to bail, the pursuit of civil damages, and in-state tuition as well as financial aid (Cambell, 2011). Analyzing immigrants in Phoenix, at the culmination of these propositions with SB1070, provides a glimpse into the current political climate and debates on immigration. Including citizenship status in studies highlights the constraints and influences in assimilation and identity formation, as well (Romero 2013).

Using in-depth interviews and surveys administered in South Phoenix during 2009-2013 as part of a larger mixed methods study (Quiroga et al. 2014), Chapter 2 assesses whether life satisfaction varies by how integrated immigrants are at the time of the interviews. The findings from the mixed methods approach suggest there is small variation in life satisfaction by immigrant index scores. Common themes that emerged from respondents with low scores that indicated some life dissatisfaction included difficulty mastering the English language and barriers to attending school in the United States. However, the responses of more integrated individuals exemplified how they navigated bureaucracies, became fluent in English (as opposed to only learning the language), and desired to learn new skills.

Chapter three focuses on the social incorporation of mixed-nativity families by using a qualitative sample of families returning to the State of Mexico collected in 2010 (Medina and Menjívar 2015). The State of Mexico was chosen as the research site for its prime location of returnees and its migrant center. The number of returnees increased from 13,597 in 2000 to 60,231 by 2010 (Masferrer and Roberts 2012). Current research shows that migrant children have difficulty in adapting in schools because of their lack of language proficiency in Spanish (Bazán-Ramirez and Galván-Zariñana 2013). The migrant center in San Pedro served as a source of entry to interviewing migrant families.

In-depth and informal interviews were administered to Mexican returnees and U.S.-born children over the age of five years old. Purposive sampling was employed to recruit 23 individuals (N=23) from 13 families consisting of 13 adults and 10 children. Most families left the United States due to tightening borders and most had at least one undocumented parent. Analyzing via a context of return framework, findings suggest that

parent and child experiences differ in how they are received by local community and immediate and/or extended family members. Moreover as family units, they are more often than not, experiencing prejudices and non-prejudices from other locals and family.

Chapter four focuses on how mixed-status families use the concepts of citizenship and nationality and considers whether parents and children differ in their use of these concepts after relocating to Mexico. A cultural citizenship framework is utilized to examine qualitative data collected in 2010 in the State of Mexico. Findings show that both parents and children in mixed-status families use concepts of citizenship and nationality synonymously. Further analyses indicate that both groups identify with the U.S., regardless of their birth location. These findings illustrate that feeling connected to the U.S. transcends the borders, and claiming U.S. national identity extends the geographical nation state line of the country where they feel they belong.

In Chapter five, I recap the purpose and findings of the three separate analytical chapters (Chapters two, three, and four), review the previous research, reiterate the limitations of the current research work, and summarize the implications and contribution of this dissertation.

CHAPTER 2

IMMIGRANT INTEGRATION AND LIFE SATISFACTION IN ARIZONA

Introduction

Immigrants make up 17.1% of the current U.S. population (U.S. Census 2013) and play an important role in the labor force (Bean, Leach, and Lowell 2004), political elections, and in schools (Alba and Nee 2003). Unlike the predominately European immigrants from earlier waves, the majority of today's newcomers are from Latin America, Asia, and the Caribbean, with significantly diverse socioeconomic backgrounds (Jiménez 2011). The groups now vary in their settlement patterns and occupy new destinations than previous waves of migrants (Balassiano and Maldonado 2013; Jiménez 2011). Although some contexts are welcoming toward foreigners (Marrow 2009; Tienda and Haskins 2011), many parts of the U.S. are hostile toward newcomers (Felix 2013; Flores 2014; Schwartz et al. 2014). These anti-immigrant attitudes are reflected by increases in proposed anti-immigration legislation at the local and State levels and even on the national level as reflected by the historically high number of deportations occurring under President Obama. Because so many adults and children are affected, both directly and indirectly, by the enforcement of U.S. immigration policies, it is important to understand how immigrants and their children are faring, and whether immigrant integration efforts are being thwarted. Since immigrants' full integration into U.S. society and the economy can take multiple generations (Jiménez 2011), this can carry different implications for theory and policy in a variety of sectors (Bean et al. 2013; Brown and Bean 2006; Jiménez 2011).

Scholars measure immigrant integration with a variety of theoretical and disciplinary approaches. Immigrant integration outcomes are measured via education (Bean et al. 2011), language (Bumgarner and Lin 2013; Glick, Walker, and Luz 2013), health (Marsiglia et al. 2011; Palloni and Arias 2013), housing, political and bureaucratic participation (Marrow 2009), employment, well-being, and even life satisfaction (Barger, Donoho, and Wayment 2014). However, differing frameworks and measurements make it difficult to draw holistic conclusions about how integrated immigrants are (Berry 1997). Some of this is due to the different foci of scholars from different disciplines. For example, those fields focused primarily on individuals, such as psychology, examine integration through internalized individual processes. Other fields such as sociology are more interested in group patterns and assess integration at the group level. In this case, outward behaviors such as English language use, socioeconomic attainment, residential integration/segregation, voting, naturalization and citizenship, intermarriage, perceptions of belonging, are the appropriate outcomes for measuring integration (Jiménez 2011). Unfortunately, many studies of these realms account for demographic variables and structural constraints that are associated with integration but fail to provide in-depth understanding of the complexities of integration and miss the cultural, and individual characteristics and features of the dominant society that might be barriers to integration (Berry 1997). On the other hand, qualitative studies provide rich data, but it is difficult to generalize to other groups and contexts due small sample sizes and limited geographic scope.

This chapter reviews the recent immigrant integration literature and then presents analyses designed to evaluate whether immigrants feel better about their life decisions

(life satisfaction) as they become integrated into their host society. Previous studies largely focus on integration as the outcome of interest or variations in socioeconomic status among those with different levels of integration. The contribution here is to ask whether becoming integrated into the host society is also associated with emotional well-being. In the following section, I provide an overview of the integration literature with a focus on the multiple dimensions of integration that are frequently studied and the importance of 'life satisfaction' as an outcome of integration. I then cover the methodology and present my findings on how life satisfaction can be evaluated by how integrated immigrants are. I then complement the findings with narrative data and end with a conclusion and discussion.

Immigrant Integration Literature and Dimensions

Due to its complexity, there are several caveats worth mentioning before discussing immigration integration and its scope. First, each wave of immigrants has come to the U.S. under restrictive immigration laws, quotas, and U.S. interests of that time. Second, societal standards of what is appropriate integration has changed and will continue doing so (Brown and Bean 2006). Third, new generations of immigrant researchers study assimilation according to their values, theories, and concepts of what being an insider or outsider means (Gans 1997). Fourth, future scholars will face the difficult task of understanding migration experiences under new circumstances rather than what was experienced in the past (DeWind and Kasinitz 1997). Therefore, research needs to acknowledge the fluid nature of measuring integration and consider the social context in which integration is being assessed. With this forewarning, we can then begin

to make sense of the factors that researchers suggest are important in the integration process for recent immigrants who arrived in the last few decades.

Integration is the process by which newcomers and communities settle and mutually adapt to one another on the individual and institutional level (Alba and Nee 2003). Others have described it as incorporation, where immigrant groups and host societies “come to resemble one another” without a fixed timetable governing the process (Brown and Bean 2006). However, the strand of literature on integration stems from the classical assimilation perspective used to understand how individuals assimilate into the mainstream (Alba and Nee 1997). Early works described assimilation as “a process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons and groups and, by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated with them in a common cultural life” (Park and Burgess 1921). In Parks view, assimilation is inevitable (Park 1928). Later, Milton Gordon defined assimilation as the influence over a particular group, fusion of two groups, cross fertilization of heritage, and other hybrid definitions of social processes (Gordon 1964). He viewed it as an Anglo-Saxon, white Protestant benchmark for immigrants to strive for and completely resign to (Gordon 1964). He identified seven dimensions to assist in measuring a groups’ assimilation according to individual and group criteria: cultural or behavioral and structural changes, marital, identificational, attitude and behavior receptional, and civic participation (Gordon 1964).

These classical frameworks have been critiqued for their one-sided nature or “straight-line” and incapability of the ethnic group having a positive role in immigrant adaptation (Alba and Nee 2003; Brown and Bean 2006). In fact, classical assimilation

theories have become outdated due to the fact that reciprocal influences between minority and majority groups, generational effects, and even reciprocal effects between group processes and individual attainment are ignored (Alba and Nee 1997). Further details about these criticisms can be found in the core immigrant integration literature (e.g., Alba and Nee 1997; Brown and Bean 2006; DeWind and Kasinitz 1997).

Despite Park redefining the concept of assimilation over the course of his career and classical theory criticisms, his work still remains fundamental in the area of assimilation and racial studies (Alba and Nee 2003; Desmond and Emirbayer 2010; Haller and Lynch 2011; Telles and Ortiz 2011). The assimilation framework has expanded considerably and new dimensions have been added. Segmented assimilation for example, is a framework for analyzing the outcomes of second generation immigrants and it allows three possible multidirectional-patterns – upward mobility, downward mobility, and parallel integration (Zhou 1997). The segmented assimilation framework permits for reciprocal influences and various outcomes (Zhou 1997) while analyzing immigrants in contexts of reception. For example, Telles and Ortiz (2008) discuss how individual variables such as parental status, gender, intermarriage, and skin color shape Latino integration. Besides the benefit of allowing multi-directional patterns of integration, broader components such as government policies, societal prejudices, and resource characteristics are also considered within the segmented assimilation framework (Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Portes and Zhou 1993).

This study builds on the strand of context of reception scholarship by examining immigrant life satisfaction within the *hostile context* of Phoenix, Arizona. From a sociological view, context of reception refers to the way in which established residents in

the receiving society treats its newcomers (Portes and Rumbaut 2001). This definition parallels and also builds on one of Gordon's seven dimensions he argued shapes assimilation: attitudinal and behavioral reception. Government policies, societal reception, and the coethnic community within the context of reception also shape adaptation patterns (Portes 1997). Within psychology, the context of reception has been similarly delineated "as the ways in which the receiving society constrains and directs the acculturation options available to migrants, and we frame acculturative stress and discrimination under the heading of an unfavorable context of reception" (Schwartz et al. 2010).

Although earlier studies focus on contexts of reception or include contextual level variables in their analyses, limited research has focused solely on receiving societies that are hostile towards newcomers (i.e. Landale et al. 2015). For example, Haller and Lynch's (2011) work on education and occupational achievement utilize a segmented assimilation framework and includes family variables, school context, and academic outcomes. In another study examining the impact of networks and context of reception on asset accumulation strategies in a relatively new receiving context (Missouri), Valdivia and colleagues (2008) find that newcomers had positive views of their context of reception but some felt undocumented immigrants were vulnerable and others were concerned about being targeted and picked up by immigration agents. Although these are important findings, their findings fill in the literature gap on new destinations rather than hostile contexts. The few studies based out of Arizona showcase the benefits of addressing anti-immigrant perceptions to understand how laws and policies affect Latino youths (and other groups) (Santos and Menjivar 2014). In their study, Santos and

Menjivar (2014) find a small but significant negative impact of SB1070 on the well-being of Latino youth.

I particularly explore how life satisfaction is shaped by multiple dimensions such as individual factors, proximal and distal causes, incremental changes, and multiple mechanisms taking place at a variety of levels (Alba and Nee 2003). Instead of solely relying on demographic variables, I gather literature from various areas and put together a list of individual, household and contextual factors that have been found to shape immigrant integration and life satisfaction. Some of these factors include legal status, the ability to mobilize resources, social networks, and policies. Although this list of factors may appear like it covers too many dimensions, most of these already contribute to immigrant integration outcomes (MIPEX 2014) or life satisfaction.

Life satisfaction as a measure of immigrant integration

One way of evaluating the success of immigrant integration is by assessing life satisfaction. Although the concept of life satisfaction is a subjective measure because it is unobservable, various studies have been successful in analyzing life satisfaction outcomes via assimilation frameworks and it is accepted as a proper standard of evaluation (Portes 1997). Scholars have captured the concept of life satisfaction using categories (Barger et al. 2014) or scales (Peek et al. 2006; Safi 2009). However, these studies have limitations. First, these studies have largely been conducted outside those contexts of reception that we might describe as hostile to newcomers. Analyzing immigrants' integration within contexts of heightened hostility is important because policies can affect the livelihood of individuals directly and indirectly. Moreover, their experience with hostility, discrimination, etc. might also lower immigrants' incentive to

integrate while also reducing life satisfaction. Second, samples tend to include older immigrants which may bias the results. Third, although Barger and colleagues' (2014) analyzed racial and ethnic disparities with a large sample, it is unclear as to whether any of the Hispanics sampled were foreign born. Notwithstanding, generation can play an influential role in their integration, and for this reason integration is better captured in generations beyond the first. The first generation sets the stage for future children and grandchildren because they will decide on whether or not they will retain their native language or become English dominant, housing decisions, and intermarrying (Portes 1997).

This chapter takes advantage of in-depth interview data which captures perspectives of immigrant life satisfaction. Interviewers asked individuals how satisfied they are with their life decisions directly. This study takes place in Phoenix, Arizona, an important and understudied context. Arizona Senate Bill 1070 (SB1070), one of the first and most extreme of the local and State legislative actions against immigrants in the United States, captured national attention. In this context, immigrants and their family members are likely to experience a heightened degree of psychological distress and perhaps lower life satisfaction. Evaluating life satisfaction directly from open ended questions and considering the context of reception yields a more comprehensive look at how immigrants are faring today.

There are a variety of individual, household, and community factors that are likely associated with life satisfaction outcomes. The following review of factors is not exhaustive but they bridge macro and micro perspectives on measuring immigrant integration and well-being. The list of factors goes beyond demographic characteristics to

include intrinsic skills and abilities, resistance strategies, and political climate. In doing so, this chapter adds to scholarship on immigrant integration, context of reception, and life satisfaction.

Individual Level Factors/Indicators:

Age of Arrival

Assimilation models suggest native birth contributes to successful adaptation (Zhou 1997). In order to carry out analyses on immigrant outcomes, knowledge of birth country and age of arrival are necessary to be able to observe distinctions between generations and cohorts (Rumbaut 2004). Rumbaut (2004) finds that generation cohorts and sociodevelopmental contexts matter in adaptation processes and social mobility. Generation makes a difference in life satisfaction outcomes. In a study comparing mental health and well-being of Mexican immigrants, immigrants reported more stress than Mexican Americans (Cuellar, Bastida, and Braccio 2004). We can expect that life satisfaction will vary depending on age of arrival. In other words, native born individuals and those that were raised in the U.S. as young children will have higher life satisfaction outcomes.

Access to Resources

Legal status plays a major role in how immigrants adapt as it can shape individuals' life chances in significant ways, just like other axes of stratification (Marquardt et al. 2013; Menjívar and Abrego 2009; Menjivar and Kanstroom 2014; Suárez-Orozco et al. 2011; Yoshikawa 2011). For example, Arizona's House Bill 2030 requires government employees to verify the immigration status of those applying for public programs (Leary and Sanchez 2008). Unauthorized legal status also isolates

Mexican immigrants and may also prevent them from obtaining integration services that seek to support them (Laglagaron 2010). In the job sector, a lack of legal status may impair job mobility (Massey and Bartley 2005). Even within the legal system, a person's unauthorized legal status makes it difficult to access unbiased judges to rule parental rights in their favor (Hall 2010). Furthermore, legal status shapes not only the way First and 1.5 generations live out their daily lives, but also opportunities, interpretations and behaviors (Abrego 2011). Since legal status has been found to play a significant role in outcomes that measure immigrant integration, it is expected that legal status will also play a part in life satisfaction.

Available Resources

Researchers have recognized that a driver's license facilitates the integration process (Ea 2008). A driver's license is a resource which allows immigrants to get to and from work (Hagan, Castro, and Rodriguez 2009). Having a driver's license decreases the perception of economic hardships (Donato and Armenta 2011). Although a drivers license is very much tied to legal status and is an example of how legal status limits/facilitates access to other resources, several states allow undocumented drivers to obtain licenses to drive. In this study, I treat a drivers license as a resource because under Arizona law, undocumented individuals (with the exception of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals) are prohibited from obtaining a drivers license. It is expected that when immigrants do not have the necessary resource of a driver's license, life satisfaction scores will be low.

Resource Mobilization

More often than not, researchers include social capital as a proxy in research studies for mobilizing support (Diaz-McConnell and Akresh 2008). Being able to mobilize resources reflects a person's ability to deploy or bridge on existing social capital while in a host society, whether the receiving context is receptive or not. In Arizona, immigrants have been able to weather the immigration and economic strain by using multiple strategies to get by. These strategies include altering household membership, limiting consumption, altering household labor, and drawing on social networks (Quiroga 2015). These examples illustrate how immigrants structure/restructure households to address crises but also highlight how immigrants would mobilize financial resources in case of an emergency. When immigrants are able to mobilize resources in their host state, they may find their immigrant experiences more positive or be more satisfied with their lives.

Alienation

New immigrants are vulnerable to isolation, feeling unwanted and devalued (Ea 2008). Physical segregation can explain this isolation (Eastwood et al. 2013). Among Latino day laborers, isolation and discrimination has been found to impact mental health (Negi 2013). In fact, being far away from family saddened immigrants and although they tried to maintain contact with their loved ones, their isolation was further aggravated because they avoided sharing their day to day migrant experiences, unemployment, struggles and challenges with relatives on the phone. In other settings, migrant isolation predicted maternal depressive symptoms (Eastwood et al. 2013). However, emotional support, a diverse social network, and a spouse have also been found to positively shape immigrant life satisfaction (Barger et al. 2014). Adding to the complexity, it is also

important to note that immigrants can draw on social networks and isolate themselves simultaneously.

Language

English language ability is a major individual and group level factor that is associated with immigrant adaptation (Zhou, 1997). Undocumented migrants are less likely to speak or understand English (Frank D. Bean et al., 2013). However, Spanish speakers and non-citizen Mexican immigrants place a very high importance on English proficiency (Dowling, Ellison, and Leal 2012), but time and transportation may pose barriers in learning or attending English classes (Valdivia et al. 2008). Being able to speak English allows immigrants to communicate with others in their communities, such as employers, colleagues, neighbors and other social actors in the receiving context. For example, language deficiencies imposes barriers for immigrants in obtaining mental healthcare (Kim, Aguado Loi, et al. 2011) and makes them vulnerable to poor physical health (Kim, Worley, et al. 2011). Limited English also leads to educational achievement and culture gaps (Good, Masewicz, and Vogel 2010). Furthermore, direct contact with others also shapes feelings of belonging (McMillan and Chavis 1986) and may also shape feelings of life satisfaction.

Education

Educational outcomes are not only markers for how well immigrants are integrating into mainstream society, but education attainment levels shape other relationships. In terms of educational outcomes, an array of education research focuses on how immigrant children are doing in school compared to their white counterparts (Hammer, Lawrence, and Miccio 2007, 2008; Pérez, Tabors, and López 2007). Scholars

have focused on whether children have access to quality education and dual language programs, and captured the differences between groups (Bean et al. 2011). However, limited research focuses on adult learners and new immigrants, even as many immigrants migrate as adults with low levels of education and limited English proficiency. No current connections between education and life satisfaction outcomes have been made thus far. However, when immigrants are able to access quality education, excel in tests, and are involved in their schools, we can expect that this leads to higher levels of well-being. Education on its own can be an indicator of well-being, but education also has positive effects on life satisfaction (Elgar et al. 2011).

Household Level Factors:

Socioeconomic status

Socioeconomic (SES) status shapes the way immigrants integrate into U.S. society and can also be a measure of integration on its own. Socioeconomic status is a major contributor to racial disparities in health (Williams et al. 2010). SES interacts with race (Williams et al. 2010) and is often measured in combination with education (Gallo et al. 2013). For example, in a study examining the associations between socioeconomic status (measured via socioeconomic status and education) and stress, SES was negatively associated with stress levels. Furthermore, economic standing remains important in the second generation (Perlmann and Waldinger 1997). Hispanics also have lower life satisfaction than whites, but when SES is controlled for, these differences were eliminated (Barger et al. 2014).

Mixed-Status families

Mixed-status families, those containing individuals with a mix of nativity and authorization statuses (Fix and Zimmerman 1999 or 2001), face challenges that other migrants do not. Members of households can possess various legal statuses and this poses a threat to children who are underage because parents can be deported at any time or because undocumented parents may be fearful of asking for the social benefits that their U.S.-citizen children have a right to obtain, which can directly affect the paths of integration beyond the immigrant generation. When parents are separated from their children, bonds between parents and children are strained and intensified (Dreby 2010). Adolescents from mixed-status families internalize and may experience tensions about immigrant and native identities (Lara-Cinisomo, Xue, and Brooks-Gunn 2013). Furthermore, U.S.-born children in mixed-status households are not afforded opportunities like their native born peers because of their parents' undocumented status (Fix and Zimmermann 1999). Recently, Quiroga and colleagues (2014) found that immigration policies geared at undocumented individuals had a ripple effect on the psychological distress of mixed-status households. With the aforementioned studies suggesting the impact of mixed-status on migrant and non-migrants' well-being, we can expect that having at least one person vulnerable to deportation lowers the life satisfaction for everyone in the household.

Community Level Factors

Reception of society

Government policies, societal reception, and coethnic communities shape second generation outcomes (Portes and Zhou 1993). Policies geared towards immigrants prevent immigrants from becoming full participants in the U.S. Latinos who perceive

their communities as welcoming, accepting, and open, are likely to adjust differently than those who experience racial profiling or other negative experiences (Valdivia et al. 2008). In fact, perceptions of discrimination significantly predict life satisfaction and quality of life (Portes and Böröcz 1989; Portes and Zhou 1993; Safi 2009; Valdivia et al. 2008). Since studies demonstrate that outcomes vary by whether or not the host society is receptive, it is expected that life satisfaction outcomes will also vary by how immigrants perceive their receiving society.

Presence of social networks

Migrant networks are social ties linking sending communities and destination points in a receiving society: “These ties bind migrants and nonmigrants within a complex web of complementary social roles and interpersonal relationships that are maintained by an informal set of mutual expectations and prescribed behaviors” (Massey et al. 1987: 140). Migrant networks contribute to labor migrations self-feeding character and community structure (Massey 1990). Networks can be based on kinship, friendship, paisanaje (fellow migrant) and can buffer the effects of integration challenges. Friends and family provide immigrants with job leads, information on schools, and other various forms of social support including information on how to get ahead (Domínguez and Watkins 2003). They may serve as a primary source of information in the absence of community resources (Valdivia et al. 2008). Although there are many benefits relating to social support, supportive networks are only conducive to the extent in which the new environment allows (Menjívar 1997) such that when opportunity structures are limited individuals in networks may be unable to assist loved ones in need (Menjívar 2000). In fact, socioeconomic, environmental, and psychosocial barriers may hinder social support

(Hurtado-de-Mendoza et al. 2014). In this study, it is expected that immigrants who are able to reciprocate and deploy social capital with their networks under Arizona's hostile conditions will have higher life satisfaction outcomes.

To be clear, this chapter attempts to understand how satisfied immigrants are with their lives according to their level of integration, a measurement across various levels (i.e. individual, family and contextual indicators of integration). I consider individual, household, and community level factors based on what the previous literature has identified as important in immigrant integration. I assess the life satisfaction domain of a representative sample in South Phoenix, Arizona. The present study 1) evaluates life satisfaction by immigrant integration progression and 2) identifies themes within life satisfaction outcomes that are not captured by quantitative data.

Methods

Data

This study draws on survey data (Quan) and qualitative (Qual) interviews gathered between 2009-2010 in South Phoenix, Arizona (see Quiroga, Medina, & Glick, 2014 for more detail on survey methodology). One hundred and twenty six (N=126) surveys were administered to a random sample and focused on demographic information, migration histories, self-reported health, housing and food security, and social networks at wave one. Semi-structured interviews were administered to a subsample of wave one households. These interviews covered five domains: immigration and settlement, friendships and social relationships, health keeping, employment and community. Interviews averaged 90 minutes and took place at the respondents' homes in the language of their choice – Spanish or English - with bilingual/bicultural interviewers. Purposive

sampling yielded 54 participants but only 43 individuals had sufficient data for the mixed-methods analysis presented in this study.

Procedures

Survey data were captured electronically and entered into Stata. Semi-structured interviewee data were transcribed, entered, and then coded in MAXQDA, a text analysis software based on a developed coding schema. Since 1) the goal of the mixed methods analysis was to evaluate life satisfaction based on a holistic (rather than through a micro or macro lens) way of viewing integration and 2) The research question required both Qual and Quan variables, a mixed methods analysis is appropriate (Gonzalez Castro et al, 2010). Using mixed methods is one way of bridging micro and macro perspectives with the right design. Mixed methods allows survey data to be complemented by the rich stories in-depth interviews provide.

Measures

Descriptive statistics and measurement notes are available in Table 1.

Index Indicators

There is some precedence for creating indices of integration. For example, the Migration Policy Index (MIPEX) is a research tool for policy makers and researchers so assessments can be made as to whether or not integration efforts and policies are effective (Niessen 2013). Although the MIPEX index contains 148 policy indicators revealing whether residents are guaranteed equal rights, responsibilities, and opportunities, its use is limited. The MIPEX relies on macro level indicators (e.g. policies aimed at education, labor market, family reunification, political participation, long term residence, nationality, and anti-discrimination (MIPEX 2014)) but does not include demographic

levels. In this chapter, the MIPEX is not utilized but I do re-create a smaller version of the research tool tailored to a hostile context but capture various levels of analysis for a more comprehensive analysis on how “integration” shapes outcomes such as life satisfaction. Mixed methods were employed in the study design, development of the immigration index measure, and analysis. Both quantitative and qualitative data were used to create the index. I take Plaza and Henry’s (2006) list of contributing factors for re-integration (encompassing length of stay, stage in lifestyle, socioeconomic status and available resources, capacity of society, alienation, transnational connections, extended networks and co-ethnics, and return visits) and apply it to the integration experience. I added missing factors such as belonging to a mixed-status household for a more accurate picture of today’s migrants (DeWind and Kasinitz 1997), to create a 11 point Integration Index (II). The II takes into account various individual, family, and society level factors (i.e. length of stay, socioeconomic status, and stability of a host country) (Berry 1997).

Index factors were derived from both survey and narrative data, and proxy variables were used when necessary. Eight of the 11 index factors stemmed from quantitative variables and three indicators were created from qualitative data. Quantitative variables were recoded into dichotomized variables so as to build a tool for measuring integration progression. The string variable RAISE2000 from the survey data was dichotomized as well. Theoretical relationships were considered and directions of the variables were tailored as necessary (reverse coding). Meanwhile, qualitative codes ISOLATION (proxy variable for alienation), DEPLOY (proxy for presence of social networks) code were dichotomized in MAXQDA for use in Stata. Using common identifiers, the two datasets (MAXQDA and Stata) were merged into a dta file, allowing

qualitative derived indicators to be merged with the recoded quantitative indicators in a summative scale, using a listwise deletion. Although the index theoretically ranges from 0 (low integration) to 11 (high integration), the respondents' integration index totals ranged between 4 and 11, with a mean of 6. Details on the recoding can be seen in Table 1.

Life satisfaction

The dependent variable in this analysis derives from a qualitative code LIFE SATISFACTION, which is based on the life satisfaction question, "How happy are you with the decisions that you've made?" The broad LIFE SATISFACTION code was subcoded into three mutually-exclusive categories -- "dissatisfied", "mixed", and "satisfied" -- in order to capture the nuances and realities of immigrant lives and feelings.

Index scores (Quant) were then imported back into MAXQDA based on common identifiers and a mixed methods analysis was conducted. The index totals (Quant) were cross tabulated with the data driven life satisfaction codes (Qual). A chi squared test was not conducted due to the small sample size. However, through the mixed methods analysis, I was able to assess if life satisfaction varies by index scores. Each satisfaction outcome and index score grouping was then evaluated for themes to help explain the scores.

Findings

When life satisfaction prompt answers were analyzed closely, I found that respondents did not answer in binary terms: "Yes I'm satisfied" or "No I am not", rather they felt both satisfied and dissatisfied simultaneously. As a result, I categorized life satisfaction answers in terms of "Dissatisfied", "Mixed", and "Satisfied" to analyze for

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics and Measurement Notes.

	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	Notes	Quant/Qual
<u>Individual Level Factors</u>						
Age of arrival	.42	.50	0	1	AGEENTERUS: 0 being >16 yrs, 1 = <16.	Quant
Access to Resources	.76	.43	0	1	STATUS: 0 =undocumented, 1 =documented.	Quant
Available resources	.52	.50	0	1	AZDRIVERLICENSE: 0= no DL, 1 =yes DL.	Quant
Mobilizing resources	.55	.50	0	1	RAISE2000: The open ended question, "If you were in a situation where you had to get \$2000 in one week, how would you manage to do that?"; 0= inability or no response, 1= responses naming social networks, institutions, or a responding with a game plan.	Quan-Qual
Alienation	.27	.45	0	1	ISOLATION: 0 =clear mention of isolation, 1= no mention of isolation.	Qual
Language	.47	.50	0	1	SOMEENG: 0 =no English, 1 = for some English or proficiency.	Quant
Education	.16	.37	0	1	EDU: 0 = Grades 1-12, 1 = "Community College (Escuela Profesional)", "Vocational or Technical School (Escuela vocacional o técnica)", "College (bachelor's degree) " and "Graduate or Professional Degree (master's degree, Ph.D., M.D., J.D., etc, "Refused" and "don't know"	Quant
<u>Household Level Factors</u>						
Socioeconomic status	.70	.46	0	1	FINSTRAN: 0 = "very difficult", "somewhat difficult", 1 = "easy". Those that refused or answered "don't know" were treated as missing.	Quant
Mixed Nativity	.83	.38	0	1	0=mixed nativity, 1=household members have the same nativity	
<u>Community Level Factors</u>						
Reception of society	.44	.50	0	1	CHILLING_EFFORT: 0 = "More efforts", 1 for "fewer efforts" and "no change". "Refused" and "don't know =" were coded as missing.	Quant
Presence of social networks	.82	.39	0	1	DEPLOY: 0 = no mention of social network support, 1=Mentioned deploying social support	Qual
<u>Life Satisfaction</u>						
Index Score Total	6.2	1.9	2	10	AGEENTERUS + STATUS + AZDRIVERLICENSE+RAISE2000 + ISOLATION + SOMEENG + EDUCATION + MIXEDNATIVITY + FINSTRAN + CHILLING_EFFORT + DEPLOY	Qual

*N=43

variation. In this fashion, the majority felt satisfied with their life decisions or had mixed feelings. Those that were in mixed and satisfied groups had index scores ranging between 2-9. Those that were dissatisfied had integration scores between 5-8.

Low integration scores (1-5)

Individuals who scored low (1-5) on the integration index varied in their answers about life satisfaction (see Figure 1). The majority were mixed, some were satisfied, and the few were dissatisfied with their life decisions. Those that were satisfied expressed happiness with their employment status and decisions to migrate. However, the primary reasons they gave for being dissatisfied with their life decisions included being unable to attend school in the U.S., their inability to speak English, regrets for not saving more, and being unhappy with their housing situation.

Figure 1. Mixed Methods Analysis

Index Total	NOT SATISFIED	BOTH	YES SATISFIED	SUM	N
0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
2	0%	50%	50%	100%	2
3	0%	100%	0%	100%	3
4	0%	50%	50%	100%	3
5	17%	33%	50%	100%	6
6	0%	57%	43%	100%	9
7	0%	63%	38%	100%	10
8	20%	60%	20%	100%	5
9	0%	67%	33%	100%	4
10	0%	0%	100%	100%	1
SUM	0%	0%	0%	0%	0

Index Total	NOT SATISFIED	BOTH	YES SATISFIED	SUM	N
0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0
2	0%	0%	5%	7%	6
3	0%	0%	10%	0%	6
4	0%	0%	5%	7%	6
5	0%	50%	10%	21%	17
6	0%	0%	20%	21%	19
7	0%	0%	25%	21%	22
8	0%	50%	15%	7%	14
9	0%	0%	10%	7%	8
10	0%	0%	0%	7%	3
SUM	0%	100%	100%	100%	100

Mixed satisfaction with life decisions

Individuals who had mixed feelings about their life decisions spoke about being thankful about having their families with them but wished they had more opportunities to work. Forty three year-old Rosario has been in the U.S. for 29 years. She lives with her husband, daughter, son-in-law, and grandchild. Rosario explains why she has mixed feelings,

Well right now I have my family, but I still need other things. I need to make decisions to make something of myself because I want to work. My kids are in school and I want to do something different. I want to work, be independent. And it sounds bad right, because I have a husband. But I want to feel needed. Before I couldn't but now I want to because that's what's needed. -Index Score of 3

Similarly, Alejandra feels the same about her employment situation. Alejandra, a 66 year-old woman who migrated at age of 41, was able to “fix her papers” through the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA). She has two children and five U.S.-born grandchildren. Despite her age, she still defines herself by her work. Alejandra elaborates about the importance of working, “I am fine, because I don't ask for what I don't deserve. Work and life. Without work, there is nothing.”

Both Rosario and Alexandria center their answers on their desires to work for their futures' sake. So does secure employment play a role in life satisfaction?

Immigrants are often bound by the state of the economy, open positions, and even contextual factors that influence employability. Many participants in the larger study were impacted by the recession, immigration raids, and the effects of SB1070 on employment opportunities.

Education was also a major theme in mixed life satisfaction responses. Forty six year-old Virginia emigrated from Mexico at the age of 33. She is married with one U.S.-

born child and works at a fast food restaurant. Virginia elaborates on what leads her to have mixed feelings with her current life happenings:

Well, one always thinks about working and all that, but I regret not going to school here, or over there [Mexico]. Not going to school, learning English. I never thought to go. And [now], I see older children argue and say things and I don't understand them. – Index Score of 5

Virginia identifies that English facilitates communication with others. The lack of English proficiency appears to be a major theme for life satisfaction regrets, regardless of the index score. This also highlights the fact that newcomers may not be able to access English learner classes or attend U.S. schools because of their age, or their position when they arrived in the U.S. Research that focuses on language acquisition must consider that many immigrants may not have a solid foundation in basic education because they may not have attended school in their native countries due to poverty or other circumstances.

Satisfied with life decisions

Fifty-seven year-old Isaac is a Mexican immigrant who migrated to the U.S. at the age of 30. He obtained legal authorization through the 1986 amnesty as well. Isaac has two foreign born children and five U.S.-born grandchildren. He shares with us why he is satisfied with his life,

I can say that I am well. From 1-10, I'd say my life the satisfaction is an 8. I'm satisfied because my children are from here and they will not battle with paper issues, or schooling, or any of that. Compared to those that will not be coming to the U.S. And well, they are American citizens.

Although Isaac does not have a high index score (4), he alludes to intergenerational mobility via U.S. citizenship. Isaac identifies the legal status advantages that his children and grandchildren have as U.S. citizens and the access it allows to

further one's education. He also hints at the idea that citizenship comes with political power, particularly for the second and third generation. So although Isaac may have only scored a 4 on the integration index, his life satisfaction is based on his life decisions (his decision to migrate) that future generations will benefit from.

Dissatisfied with life decisions

Although dissatisfaction with life decisions was an uncommon response, a 49 year-old immigrant woman named Patricia who has been married for 31 years with 2 U.S.-born children responded that she is dissatisfied because of financial matters.

If I could do it over again I would save money, because I would use it. You must always use it. I would have prioritized saving for another day....because it does worry me. - Index Score of 5

The dissatisfaction of Patricia points to the need of including socioeconomic variables into life satisfaction studies. Although this study includes a proxy for socioeconomic status, future life satisfaction studies should take into consideration actual savings or retirement funds when attempting to understand life satisfaction. Principally because immigrants may not have access to retirement savings accounts, ROTH IRA's, pension plans, or other economic assets.

Average Index Score (6)

Nine individuals had integration index scores of 6. The majority had mixed feelings about their life decisions; many were satisfied and none were dissatisfied. For those that had mixed feelings, respondents reflected on migrating to the U.S., getting out of the house, obtaining an education and finding new work in a different field. A few individuals answered in simple statements about being happy with decisions they have made but fewer elaborated on their life satisfaction.

Mixed satisfaction with life decisions

Forty year-old Veronica, an immigrant woman who has been in the U.S. for 24 years, describes why she has mixed feelings,

He'll tell me, "Well let's go." He does it because he knows that I'm bored or that I'm tired of being inside the house. So he tell me, "Let's go," and he takes me. When we get come back I come back satisfied. - Index Score of 6

Even though Veronica states she is satisfied with her life decisions, she fears leaving her house because of the immigration laws and enforcement practices in Arizona. As a result of raids and the risk of “Sheriff Arpaio” entering her house at any moment, she physically isolates herself from the rest of society including her friends and family. Veronica’s family and friends are also concerned and fear the raids and checkpoints. This type of isolation raises a broader question about whether or not this could lead to poor mental health, depressive symptoms (Quiroga et al. 2014), and spouse dependence. This isolation may be the mechanism through which a hostile context of reception lowers both integration *and* life satisfaction.

The theme of education also recurs in this section. Daniel is a 42 year-old immigrant man, married with 4 U.S.-born children, and has been in the U.S. for 26 years. He has mixed feelings about his life decisions and elaborates on why he is taking classes:

The next goal is to get away from the construction field. I want to work with clients and let them know what they'll need, help them find materials...besides, they are Anglo-Saxons; I want to be prepared for Hispanic clients too. Because there will be a time when my knee won't function the same anymore and I won't be able to work the same in construction. -Index Score of 6

For this group, educational aspirations appears to shape opinions of life satisfaction.

Despite Daniel’s age, he is actively taking steps to further his career in the construction

industry and is considering his future health. Daniel understands that remaining in the same occupation will be demanding on his body. Although the current immigrant integration index does not consider occupation, perhaps it should because Daniel's story highlights how life satisfaction is based on employment and occupational factors.

Satisfied with life decisions

Jose, a 56 year-old Mexican who migrated at the age of 42 during Cuernavaca's recession explains why he is satisfied with his life decisions:

I've had luck that all my things have been fruitful. That I don't have to be searching. I made a decision to come here, and while yes it was an "all Mexican" decision, we came very ignorantly. I think that was one of the best decisions. Because we are well here. My children are happy, they have peaceful marriages, and they clean houses. The older one works in a restaurant, and cleans offices at night. They always have work. Thank God that they do. Since we've been here, we've always had employment. - Index Score of 6

Jose recognizes the importance of labor as a component of integration. Even though his daughters work in service fields similar to his as a janitor, Jose is content because his daughters are continuously employed. Their well-being is intertwined with his then. Furthermore, Jose's satisfaction about his daughters being employed mirrors Isaac's reflection on how future generations benefit from his migration experience. Jose also associates life satisfaction with peaceful marriages, work, and happiness.

High Index Scores (7-11)

Seventeen individuals scored high index scores. The majority of respondents with high integration scores expressed mixed satisfaction with their lives. A smaller number expressed that they were satisfied and a few expressed only dissatisfaction. Interestingly, those that answered that they had mixed feelings and dissatisfaction elaborated on their

responses but those that were satisfied only answered with “Yes I’m satisfied” or some variation of this answer.

Mixed satisfaction with life decisions

Among individuals who scored high on the integration index and had mixed feelings about life satisfaction, responses involve the theme of education and language, just as we observed among those with lower integration scores. Fifty-four year-old Pablo, a Mexican immigrant who immigrated at the age of 36 and is now married with children (one U.S.-born), explains his mixed feelings,

Well satisfied no. What I would do to have more but it’s not possible. If I had more time to reach my goals I’d feel more satisfied but unfortunately it doesn’t help. I need to develop myself in my life. If I had better English skills I would probably risk new things. But I’ve tried to get ahead. –
Index Score of 7

U.S.-born Elenia, a 36 year-old, wishes she would have stayed in school and suggests that her life decisions have resulted in difficult times. She has 3 children from a previous marriage and remarried a former undocumented Mexican immigrant. She currently lives with her 3 daughters and son-in-law.

Oh, there's a lot I would have done differently. Stayed in school, finished high school. Would have never made the choices that I made then, now that I know what I got myself into and how hard it is now, even with my background, sometimes, to get a job. You know? And my girls being so rebellious. No – she's good. I haven't had no problems with her, but sometimes I go through a lot with my 20-year-old. – Index Score of 7

Similarly, 46 year-old Jessica, an immigrant woman with an integration index score of 9 also explains why she has mixed feelings,

I would’ve liked to go to school more, go to college. I’m thinking that maybe later on I can go to college to get a certification to educate kids, to start an education. I’m satisfied, but I still have hope that I can get further ahead, while I can. Luckily and thank God, I don’t have any sickness that impedes me from doing so;

I can still get ahead.

Pablo, Elenia, and Jessica's reflections about educational regrets points to the importance of learning and wanting to get ahead or "risk new things" as Pablo calls it. Pablo and Jessica recognize that schooling can assist their upward mobility. Although the likelihood of adults returning to school after dropping out may be slim, younger respondents may do so and capturing the decision making process could be insightful.

In addition to education responses, others focused on housing decisions. Forty-two year-old Julian, a married immigrant with 3 children, has lived in the U.S. for 25 years. Julian expressed mixed satisfaction with his life decisions:

Well now it can't be changed because of what I've done, but if you see I made decisions that I could change. For example when we bought this house we bought this house with a high interest. And well, I made the decision of my life when I bought this house, but says the man, he is a good person, the man that gave us the house. Some 5 years ago I reviewed the papers and well it is at 7 [% interest] I say, why is it so high? And I talked to the bank to resolve it. And things that have happened for lack of experience. – Index Score of 7

Although this chapter does not focus on home ownership, immigrants consider this a milestone in their integration. In fact, home ownership can be considered a measure of integration (Diaz-McConnell and Akresh 2008; Jiménez 2011). Julian's story highlights how awareness or knowledge in this case, aided him in pursuing a lower interest rate. Although Julian attributes an original high interest rate due to his lack of experience at the time of purchase, Julian's success in reducing the interest rate exemplifies his ability to navigate the bureaucracy of the home loan industry. Julian's story is representative of how immigrants navigate the housing market in a new country.

Business ownership is also another measure of immigrant integration and it appears in this section as a life satisfaction theme. Miguel, a 47 year-old married

immigrant with 3 children, one which is U.S.-born, explains why he has mixed feelings,

I'm satisfied but sometimes I wonder, I get indecisive, because I think I can do better. But then I think no, and then I do not regret anything. But I think I can be better, like at this age. The furniture business that we have, it's getting old. That's when I begin to think, why am I selling furniture? When I have been living five almost six years off of this, you've lived. So then you think, was that decision right, do we change it or do we maintain it? I think made the right decisions, I did the best I could. I just wonder if I could have made them better. - Index Score of 8

Although Miguel questions if he made the right business decision, he has only been in the U.S. for 12 years and has established himself as a business owner. Miguel is part of the "...50,706 new immigrant business owners in Arizona...", who contribute significantly to the Arizona economy (Immigrant Policy Center 2013). In many ways, his successful business makes him a well-integrated immigrant.

Interestingly, the stories shared in this section illustrate how immigrant integration scores can be useful in understanding differences between life satisfaction outcomes. Although the topic of education came up in life satisfaction responses of those with high integration scores, these individuals reflected on home ownership and business decisions. Stories of refinancing and housing troubles are also indicative of housing costs burdens. In such cases, human capital, life course stage, assimilation indicators, and context may account for housing cost burdens (McConnell and Akresh 2009).

Undocumented immigrants in particular are more likely to experience housing-induced poverty than documented immigrants, accounting for assimilation (McConnell 2013).

Dissatisfied with life decisions

Among those who were dissatisfied with their life decisions, their responses focused on frustrations and blocked opportunities to integrate. One of these respondents, Elsy a 55 year-old woman with 8 children and has been in the U.S. since the age of 13,

reflected on her inability to study as a child and learn English,

The only thing that I would have wanted to do since I was a child is study. I should have focused more on the language of this place, English. But I thought that I wouldn't need it because in El Paso more Spanish is spoken than English. Yes! Even the people of color, you speak Spanish and they speak to you! You don't need English. I thought that it would be the same thing here. Well lots of people understand Spanish but when I came forty years ago, hardly anyone spoke Spanish. – Index Score of 8

Elsy's response sheds light on how the receiving context influences language use. Unlike El Paso, a city which facilitated her use of Spanish rather than one requiring her to learn English, Elsy finds that English is necessary in Phoenix. Elsy finds that she could benefit from English classes but finds a lack of courses available for adult learners, "...none of the schools give English lessons; there are three schools here and none give English classes to adults." Although counterintuitive, the limited language learning opportunities may also be reflective of Arizona's hostility toward immigrants speaking Spanish. Arizona's official language is English (Constitution 2006) and Proposition 203 (Anon 2000) not only requires public school instruction to be conducted in English but also limited English Language Learner (ELL) programs.

Once again, education continues to be a theme regardless of index score. However, immigrants who scored higher heavily focus on education and other indicators of immigrant integration such as home and business ownership. The non-education themes were not found in lower index scores responses. In fact, less integrated immigrants revealed stories on finding employment whereas more integrated individuals focused on getting further ahead.

Discussion and Conclusions

The majority of immigrant integration studies evaluate immigrant integration progression in terms of observable outcomes. However, few researchers approach the idea of measuring immigrant integration holistically with individual, household and contextual indicators. Yet by doing so, we can better understand aspects of immigrant lives such as life satisfaction. The preliminary findings in this study suggest that the life satisfaction of immigrants varies by how integrated they have become. Those with low and average integration scores center their answers on their decisions to migrate, but also expressed their desire to maintain and secure employment. Others focused their answers on isolation, education, and flexibility in occupational changes. Individuals with higher scores shared experiences of navigating home mortgage loan interest rates, about their business decisions, perfecting their English and learning innovative technology, and intergenerational employment. In summary, each of the score groupings had different concerns and identified different factors that may impinge their integration.

The major theme across index scores highlights immigrant regrets for not learning English earlier or being unable to attend school. This parallels earlier findings about the great importance that individuals place on education and English proficiency (Dowling et al. 2012). These findings suggest the need for future life satisfaction research to include education and language indicators, because these factors are related to one another. Age of arrival, challenges and access to English classes, and legal status should also be considered. Legal status and age of arrival shape how undocumented individuals face and experience life challenges (Abrego 2011) so immigrant generation is of particular importance. Although these indicators are often seen as demographic variables, these variables often make a difference in how immigrants assimilate. The great importance

immigrants place on their migrant experiences may also be reflective of limited educational opportunities in their home countries, their previous socioeconomic status, and reasons for migrating to the U.S. These broader questions make it necessary for researchers to consider individual, household, contextual and even historical processes and the interactions in between one another (Alba and Nee 2003)

The results in this analysis also yield new information about the life satisfaction of immigrants within a hostile context. This study provides insight as to how immigrants make sense of their life history and migration journey, and carry out decisions within Arizona's hostile environment. The life satisfaction reflections automatically include perceptions of how they make sense of the legal and social landscape. The challenges they confront on the daily basis and the topics addressed in each integration group mirror how the state and local communities expect and create for them. For a more comprehensive understanding, future research may want to consider a comparative group in another hostile context where similar legislation has been considered.

The results in this study also highlight that there is value in using life satisfaction as an indicator of immigrant integration for a few reasons. First, when asked about their life satisfaction, migrants volunteered their reasons for migrating, their journeys, and experiences in the U.S. These responses suggest that the migration experience and opportunities and barriers to integration are directly linked to individual perceptions of satisfaction. This means that future life satisfaction research on immigrants should ensure that they properly conceptualize the term.

Furthermore, some useful lessons can be drawn in terms of using individual, household, and community factors in an analysis. This piece therefore adds to the

scholarship on immigrant integration as a whole. It considers a list of indicators based off preexisting data related to immigrant integration and life satisfaction to better understand how immigrants feel about their life decisions.

Limitations

Methodologically, relying on a single index combining multiple dimensions of integration into one measure presents some limitations. Although it allows for a strong measure of overall integration, the index cannot separate or account for interactions between these factors, such as education and English, legal status and housing, and many more. Second, the index approach forces the dichotomization of each factor. While these choices are based on preexisting literature, a simple dichotomy loses information about the range of integration experiences in everyday life. Furthermore, this study does not include race and ethnicity in the analysis due to the fact that the subsample data set focused on Latino immigrants (mostly Mexicans and not many indigenous Mexicans). In future studies, race and ethnicity need to be taken into account as they can generate differing results (Bean et al. 2004).

Overall, the methodological aim of this chapter was to assess whether or not macro and micro level variables could be used to create an index. Further studies are necessary to determine if immigrant integration scores may be useful in understanding other outcomes. Theoretically, differences in life satisfaction should have varied by low, average, and high index scores because that would demonstrate that as immigrants assimilate into mainstream society, their outlook on life satisfaction would be more positive. However, only small differences between those with low and average index scores were found. This might be explained by insufficient variation within the small

sample size. The index seemed to yield better results for the highly assimilated individuals. A replication of this study would be useful to confirm these findings. Although the findings in this study are interesting, a multiple regression analysis including indicators presented in this chapter as independent variables and life satisfaction as the dependent variable would have been more suitable. Use of the larger dataset with multiple waves of data and utilize the open ended questions and retest the index with the new qualitative variable as the dependent is warranted. This would also increase the N, making for a more robust sample. This would allow for some generalizations to be made.

CHAPTER 3

RECEPTION VARIABILITY FOR MIXED-NATIVITY FAMILIES RETURNING HOME

Introduction

In 2013, Immigration and Customs Enforcement removed 33,000 unauthorized individuals who reported that they had U.S.-born children³ (Enforcement 2014). Many parents return to their country of origin with a child, despite the child's locational preference (Djajić, 2008). Thus, these deportations result in uprooting children from their familiar cultural, social, linguistic environments (Brabeck & Xu, 2010). With close to 500,000 U.S.-born children now living in Mexico and U.S. immigration laws tightening under the Obama administration (Gonzalez and Zúñiga 2014; Zúñiga and Hamann 2014), it is important to consider how mixed-status⁴ families are affected.

In the U.S., five million children live with at least one undocumented parent (Randy Capps et al. 2007). If detained, their repatriation will increase flows of Mexico-bound migration. Children will be unfamiliar with Mexico and they will face integration challenges in their newfound host society. In response to the little understanding on life, strategies, and interactions beyond the family or after returning home (Cassarino 2004), this chapter will explore how mixed-status families adjust into their local communities, they experience the impact of increasing surveillance of the border, deportation, and new found life in Mexico. This chapter will not only highlight how returnee parents (i.e., Mexican nationals) re-integrate into their country of origin, but will also highlight how

³ From all countries.

⁴ "A family in which one or both parents is a noncitizen and one or more children is a citizen" (Fix & Zimmermann, 1999; pg 397).

returnees' "foreign" children (i.e., U.S.-born children) are treated in the children's new host society (i.e., Mexico).

This chapter takes a qualitative approach to examine how families readjust in their origin/host communities and how their community, consisting of locals, friends, and extended families, react to their Mexico-bound migration. Thus, the chapter will focus on the following questions:

- Are there differences between the perceptions of Mexican national parents and their U.S.-born children in how they are received in Mexico?
- Do the experiences of families vary by parental length of time in the U.S.?

In the section that follows, I situate my work within two bodies of literature: (a) the literature on return migration, and (b) Mexico-bound migration literature because families of mixed-nativity or status include returnees and foreign children. After covering the methodology and data, I provide an in-depth analysis of how two generations⁵ report they are received and welcomed. While individual responses are important, parental responses about their children's reception experiences and vice versa are considered because it allows for a better understanding of family migration. For a holistic view, both parents and children share their perceptions of reception. This is followed by a discussion and conclusion.

Return Migration Literature

Despite its long global history, return migration continues to be a neglected area of international migration studies in comparison to the abundance of scholarship on emigration, assimilation, economic power and remittances, home community studies, etc.

⁵ U.S.-born children are considered first generation immigrants, their parents are of a returning generation because they are part of a Mexican national group that must re-adapt into their home country.

(Arce et al. 2012; Arp-Nissen 2004; Black and King 2004; Cassarino 2004; Taylor 2001).

A number of studies offer reviews of dominant return migration frameworks (See Cassarino, 2004) and highlight the contradictions between return migration and development (See Tiemoko, 2004). The smaller body of work and limited consensus on the causes and consequences of return migration is due to the difficulty of assessing the volume and scale of return migration from the United States and the difficulty of locating and surveying return migrants in the country of origin (Cassarino 2004). Although return migration is underdeveloped in comparison to topics on assimilation and migration consequences, this section addresses return migration concepts, individual factors that influence decisions to return, contextual factors associated with return, and social barriers to integration.

The complexity of migration makes it difficult to separate “returns” from circular migration. Migration itself is an unpredictable event of population change and a symptom of social and economic processes (Rowland 2011). Return migration is the act of emigrants returning to their homeland to resettle (Gmelch 1980). “Emigrants” who return are considered “returnees” (Arp-Nissen 2004; Durand 2010) or “twice-migrants” because they have migrated from two places (Allanhar 2006). Building representative samples of returnees is a challenge because migrants are also a rare and difficult to reach population in destination countries, and sampling frames are rarely available (Beauchemin and González-Ferrier 2011). Lastly, the concept of ‘home’ is fluid (Rowland 2011) which makes deciphering whether or not migrants will stay put even more difficult. As a result of such complexity, return migration is often considered

circular migration, repeat migration, and back-and-forth travel (Gmelch 1980; Pessar 1997; Taylor 2001; Tiemoko 2004).

Most literature focuses on individual factors influencing return migration (Lindstrom 1996) (such as the potential or desire to return (Moran-Taylor and Menjivar 2005; Şenyürekli and Menjívar 2012; Taylor 2001)), movement patterns (King 1978), rural-urban migration (Pessar 1997), and socio-economic changes (Tiemoko 2004). Returning to one's homeland can imply various situations: the unsuccessful migrant, the retired, and circular migrant (Durand 2010). Recent survey findings highlight migrants return for various reasons including: reunification with family members who stayed behind in their country of origin, financial reasons, nostalgia (Matt 2013), deportation, and many others. Other quantitative studies have also found that migrants return during the slow seasons of agricultural work (Arce et al. 2011) and as a result of unemployment (Tiemoko 2004). However, the major limitation with these studies is that they do not include children in their samples.

Although most return migration literature focuses on individual adult returns, an individual's family structure is also important to take into account. Few studies have captured return migration experiences of descendants, entire families, or children (Arce et al. 2012; Gonzalez and Zúñiga 2014; Şenyürekli and Menjívar 2012) in relationship to other significant social variables (Gmelch 1980). Qualitative studies have found that individuals take into consideration the many facets of their social environment when making migration decisions, such as immigration policies, job opportunities that are in market demand, and friends, family, and the health status of their parents (Şenyürekli and

Menjívar 2012). Even economic studies have been successful in including economic, social network, and subjective factors to understand return migration decisions. When immigrants marry and have children in host countries, return migration decisions then become influenced by a spouse and the future of their children (Djajić 2008). Children's inability to speak the native homeland's language, the instability of the home country's economy, and/or legal barriers to facilitate return to the host country influence parent immigrants' intentions to return to their home country (Şenyürekli and Menjívar 2012). So what becomes of the families that return home to the parents' country of origin?

Contextual factors play a role in 'returnee' integration. Interviews with Japanese-Brazilian's second generation, in-depth case studies on Caribbean's, Baja-Brits, and British-Trinidadians (Conway 2005) all find that return migrants experience social exclusions and integration challenges. Japanese-Brazilian children of migrants are "ethnically rejected as foreigners and socially marginalized because of their cultural differences" (T. Tsuda, 2003; pg 127) such as language, attitudes, and behaviors (Tsuda 1999). In a large scale qualitative study with Puerto Rican adolescents returning from the mainland, they were rejected because of their "Nuyorican" attributes (Lorenzo-Hernández 1999). These studies highlight that ancestral lands and societies may not live up to children's expectations once they return. In addition, children may expect a warm welcome by family or neighbors in the place of return and become disillusioned if the reception is not as warm as envisioned (Tiemoko 2004). Unfortunately, the aforementioned studies focus on voluntary migration, which is not always the reality for the families in this study.

Both U.S. and Mexico policies shape return migration experiences. Although the study was not designed to focus on legal status in the U.S., many families in this study are of mixed-status being with one least one parent who lacked legal authorization to live in the U.S. Many of the returns resulted from deportations, court orders, and denied residency application hearings, which makes this a unique study that will contribute timely issues concerning deportations. Furthermore, the treatment these families receive in Mexico may prompt future U.S. migration. The US born children have rights of return to their country of origin which means they have more mobility options than their parents. Children could choose to leave their parents' country of return if they feel rejected by other family or community members. The benefits of studying this unique population furthers our understanding of geographies and mobility.

Social barriers in Mexico are important to assess when investigating integration experiences of parents and children for two reasons. First, migration is rarely determined solely by individual characteristics because decisions to return are made with family characteristics in mind. In the U.S., anti-immigration laws that are directed at undocumented individuals clearly affect other family members, friends and neighbors regardless of these others' immigration status (Quiroga, Medina, & Glick, 2014). Discrimination against one family member in Mexico will also affect the rest of the family. Second, although parents may be the decision makers when it comes to return migration, children are active participants and are likely to be active participants in the return and re-integration process. Thus, it is important that children's stories be heard in their own words and for parents to share how they perceive their child is integrating because it provides a more nuanced view of family integration. Capturing both parent and

child perceptions on reception allows us to determine if variation is occurring between Mexican nationals and immigrant children. In doing so, this piece contributes to a) the gap in the literature on return migration, with special focus on those who have been affected by increased border surveillance coupled with the economic recession, and who have left the host country with plans to resettle in their homelands and b) mixed-status families and our understanding on child migrants.

Mexico-Bound Migration

Recently, changes in U.S.-bound geographic migration patterns, increasing border enforcement, Mexico's northern border insecurity, and the U.S. economic crisis has made return migration less predictable and has raised important policy issues surrounding returnees (Masferrer and Roberts 2012). For the first time in 50 years net migration from Mexico has dropped to zero (Passel, Cohn, and Gonzalez-Barrera 2012). Macro-economic reasons like the 2007-2009 U.S. recession and global crises can be attributed to the decreasing return migration numbers (Rendall, Brownell, and Kups 2011) and U.S. deportations (Arce et al. 2011).

Scholars have not reached a consensus regarding the trends of returnees to Mexico, (Rendall et al. 2011), but the latest statistics are generating concern because of their possible impact on the economy, politics, and society (Molina 2009). It is reported that 1,000,000 nationals returned between 2005-2010 (INEGI 2010). These statistics vary, due to the fact that scholars utilize different ways to define and calculate return migration (Arce et al. 2011; INEGI 2010). Historically, Mexico's returnees were undocumented, compared to those who are returning now who include low wage earning legal immigrants (Reyes 1997). Although many returnees are resettling along the

northern border, the returnee population is also high among traditional migrant departure locations (Valdez-Gardea 2012; Valle 2012).

Several motivating factors have contributed to return migration. An inland study finds that return migrants in Jalisco returned by their own accord and that nostalgia was the major reason (Matt 2013). Two thirds of these migrants were able to utilize the skills they gained in the U.S. and have improved their quality of life and household income upon return. These quantitative findings parallel earlier research using individual and household level data on Mexican return migration, which finds that decisions to return are influenced by the employment and investment opportunities of their home communities (Lindstrom 1996).

In a study conducted in the state of Mexico, which is where this study took place, return migration patterns mimic the historical gendered patterns of U.S.-bound migration with the majority of returnees being men (85% men; 15 % women) (Arce et al., 2012) (Arce et al. 2012). Arce finds that approximately 63% are household heads, some with children, and the rest are couples, parents or siblings. Due to the fact that the present study consists of more women than men, Arce's work is highly useful because it provides a large scale glimpse of returnee characteristics of the overall returning migrant population in the state of Mexico.

Interestingly, U.S.-born children are also being included in return migration reports because these children are sons and daughters to Mexican nationals who are returning (INEGI n.d.). Due to the fact that the number of immigrants in different generations is context and situation specific, the children of Mexican nationals who are

now living in Mexico are more difficult to classify. From a U.S. perspective, U.S.-born children who move to Mexico are considered *emigrants* from their birth country. In contrast, from a Mexico perspective, U.S.-born children who arrive are considered *immigrants*, *foreigners*, and even *transgenerational returns* (Arp-Nissen 2004; Durand 2010). Thus, the U.S.-born children in Mexico should not be considered “returnees” because they were not born in Mexico, despite the many who are naturalized Mexican citizens (Zúñiga and Hamann 2014). Since taxonomies are important, a mixed-nativity family in this chapter refers to a family with at least one Mexican national or *returnee*, and at least one U.S.-born child or U.S. national, *foreigner*, or immigrant, (capturing all years of arrival). Since children of returnees are U.S.-born and not Mexico-born, they will not be classified as returnees. Returnees must re-integrate into their home society and their foreign children must integrate into this society for the very first time.

Because children who are born in the U.S. are considered foreigners in Mexico, they will be subject to Mexico’s immigration policy, whose goals are to reduce U.S. bound Central American immigration flows (Gonzalez-Murphy and Koslowski 2011). The interviews in this study took place during this period of dynamic exchanges between the U.S. and Mexico regarding U.S. immigration policies and when Mexico revised its 1974 immigration law guaranteeing both documented and undocumented persons the right to report human right violations without repercussions (Gonzalez-Murphy and Koslowski 2011). Government members found guilty of violating this law will be suspended for 30 days or terminated from employment.

Current estimates show a growth in foreign born children in Mexico. The Mexican census reports approximately one million foreign children reside in Mexico and

are between the ages of 5-14 years old. Most are U.S.-born and their presence is so significant that when U.S.-born children are excluded, the median age of foreigners in Mexico drops from 37 to 12 years old (INEGI 2010, n.d.). Although most foreign children are concentrated along the border, they can be found throughout Mexico. Some attribute the young population in Mexico to Mexican mothers who gave birth in the United States but never had any intentions to reside in the U.S. (INEGI n.d.).

Today's growing return migration scholarship centers around returnees and U.S. born children in Mexico's schools and the effects of returnees on the local labor market (Anderson 2013; Gonzalez and Zúñiga 2014; Valdez-Gardea 2012; Zúñiga and Hamann 2014). However, studies on return migration are limited in several ways. First, the extant return migration literature focuses on enrolled children in schools, without considering family dynamics and life beyond the school walls. Second, this literature does not take into account immigration policy conditions. Finally, this literature focuses on only adults or children, but not both. This chapter complements the recent literature on U.S.-born children in Mexico by focusing on an understudied element of children's settlement – their reception by family, neighbors and peers in Mexico. A receiving context plays an instrumental role in how immigrants integrate into a society (Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Portes and Zhou 1993), and attitudes toward their return are indicative of how welcoming a receiving context is.

To guide this analysis, this chapter uses Portes and Rumbaut's modes of incorporation framework on the ways in which immigrants integrate in the host society: government policies, societal reception and on their coethnic community (Portes and Rumbaut 1990). This chapter focuses on the societal integration element of the receiving

context, in which the receiving society can be either prejudiced or non-prejudiced toward immigrants. “Prejudice reception is defined as the accorded nonphenotypically white groups; non-prejudiced is that accorded to European and European-origin whites” (Portes, Alejandro and Rumbaut, 2001; pg 84). Although some have been successful applying this model to assess Salvadorian’s adaptation in the U.S. through ethnographic work (Sánchez 2008), not many have utilized this framework to understand the social adaption or exclusions of return migrants.

One of the major benefits of using the modes of incorporation framework is that it does not exclude individual human capital from the integration equation. Portes and Rumbaut (Portes and Rumbaut 2001) argue that human capital such as education and skills (and social capital as it will be argued) are contingent on the receiving context. In fact, researchers have been able to utilize this model using an event history analysis to demonstrate labor market trajectories (Nee and Sanders 2010).

Although the modes of incorporation model was developed for U.S. use, it can be applied in reverse to families returning to Mexico (in this case is the receiving society). Instead of parents being first generation migrants according to the assimilation framework, U.S.-born children are the first generation migrants (or migrants for short) in Mexico. Parents are nationals in Mexico. When the framework is applied, the phenotypical non-prejudiced group is that accorded to Mestizos. In theory, U.S. children are similar in appearance, possess a similar language, and come from the same backgrounds as non-migrants so they should have an easier time fitting in (Portes and Rumbaut 2001). In the chapter, I propose that prejudice can also be accorded to the same race/ethnic group, since community members are prejudiced against U.S.-born children

who are also mestizo, but were born on the north side of the border and hence have U.S. citizenship/nationality. By utilizing an assimilation framework, it allows for a critical examination of the social context of return as it relates to how complex migrant families are treated by community members and Mexico's ability to take in their own kind. Will Mexico accept the slough of migration experience migrants bring with them and relics of their migration journey, such as U.S.-born children? Upon returning, these migrant experiences intersect and create new meanings of what is important, how they react, and attitudes they have (Arce et al. 2012). This analysis is therefore twofold. First, it utilizes a U.S.-model of assimilation in reverse to understand the differences between the perceptions of Mexican national parents and their U.S.-born children on how they are received. Perceptions of reception are reflective of how their communities are able to absorb complex families with multiple citizenships, languages, and reasons for being there. Second, this study seeks to determine if there is a variation in parent returnees' perceptions of acceptance based on their duration of residence in the United States (i.e. the length of time they were away.)

Methods and Data

Semi-structured interviews were conducted in 2010 in the town of San Pedro⁶ outside of Mexico City. Purposive sampling was employed for this qualitative study in order to obtain formal interviews with families (i.e., parents/guardians and children). This sample consisted of 12 parents and one guardian, usually a grandparent. Those who relocated to Mexico with the intention of settling, had migrated back to Mexico between 2005-2010, had at least 1 US born child between the ages of 6-17 and

⁶ A pseudo name has been created for the name of the town for confidentiality purposes.

who were residing in the focal municipality at the time of the study were invited to participate. Residence was self-reported. Semi-structured interview questions focused on migration experience, familiarity with the municipal school system, perceived community reception, and sense of belonging. Interviews lasted between 30 minutes to 3.5 hours and took place at the respondents' homes in the language of their choice (Spanish, English, or both). Community members, educators and government officials were also informally interviewed for a holistic picture of how these families were adapting. Sample characteristics can be found on Table 2.

Society Reception Findings

To analyze the social reintegration of returnees and the concurrent integration of their U.S.-born children, this chapter uses a modified version of the modes of the incorporation model. Portes' and Zhou's re-categorize societal reception in binary terms, as either prejudiced or nonprejudiced (Portes and Zhou 1993). However, social relationships cannot always be categorized in stark negative or positive terms. Dichotomies are problematic because they do not allow for the gradations of reality (Quiroga et al. 2014). In fact, respondent narratives are nuanced, complex, and not always positive. To illustrate the shades of social integration outcomes by prejudice, I add a category for those individuals that feel their society is both prejudiced and nonprejudiced. To see the differences between nativity groups, I subcategorize "societal reception" into two parts: (1) Reception by local community (non-immediate or extended family) and (2) Reception by immediate and extended family, to show the simultaneous and interactive adaptation patterns that returnees and their foreign children face when relocating to Mexico.

TABLE 2. SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

<u>Sample Size</u>				<u>Years between last migration & return</u>	
Total N	23			<i>Mexican Nationals</i>	Range 3-24
<i>Households</i>	13				Mean 13
<i>Mexican Nationals</i>	13				
<i>US-born children</i>	10			<u>Family's Last US State of Residence</u>	
				Arizona	1
				California	5
<u>Ages</u>				Colorado	2
<i>Mexican Nationals</i>	Range	31-60		Georgia	2
	Mean	36		Illinois	1
<i>US-born Children</i>	Range	6-17		Virginia	1
	Mean	12		Washington	1
<u>Sex:</u>				<u>Mixed-nativity characteristics</u>	
<i>Mexican Nationals</i>	Females	10	Males 3	US-born children only	4
<i>US-born Children</i>	Females	7	Males 3	US & Mexico born children	9
<u>Place of birth</u>				<u>Reasons for return*</u>	
<i>Mexican Nationals</i>	Edo. De Mexico	10		<i>Voluntary returns</i>	
	Jalisco	1		Children	3
	Morelos	2		Desire to return to Mexico	4
<i>US-born children</i>	California	5		Easier lifestyle in Mexico	1
	Colorado	2		US stay not intended	2
	Georgia	2		Exposing children to Mexican values	2
	Illinois	1		Tightening borders	2
	Unknown	1		Unemployment	1
	Virginia	1		<i>Involuntary Returns</i>	
	Washington	1		Deported	2
				Fears of deportation	4
				Immigration Attorney Fraud	4
<u>Mexico-bound Age</u>				Unable to cross the border	1
US-born Children	Range	4-17		*Households provided more than one reason	
	Mean	12.5			

Reception by Local Community Members (Non-immediate or non-extended family)

Individuals are less likely to stay in their host country when they do not feel a part of the community, experience discrimination in the host state, or have issues with their legal status (Chavez 1994). Similar to new immigrants who arrive in the U.S., returnees must re-integrate into their old communities. In cases where families (including both parent/guardian and child) felt their family was well received was when friends and neighbors made small talk with parents and/or children, extended coffee invitations, and initiated small town greetings. For example, sixty-year-old Leticia⁷ is the guardian of four mixed-nativity grandchildren (ages ranged between 7-13 years old), three of whom are U.S.-born. In order to maintain social ties, Leticia's daughters prefer that she raise her grandchildren because the daughters live unauthorized in the U.S. and are unable to maintain transnational visits and pay for high childcare costs in the U.S. Leticia has never been to the U.S. but almost all her children are migrants and they share stories about the dangers and struggles of migrants living in "El Norte." Leticia explains how the community received her U.S.-born grandchildren, "Everyone receives them well, no one scorns them, and my friends will say, 'your kids are so big', 'where are your kids?'" These statements make Leticia feel that her grandchildren are indeed welcome by other non-migrant locals. It makes Leticia feel good because in the U.S., her U.S.-born grandchildren felt isolated. In fact, 11-year-old Anthony (Leticia's grandson) likes to spend time in Mexico and enjoys living in more than one place. Anthony feels welcome by other locals, even though they don't know his name. They say "Hi or good morning", but Anthony's answers are inconsistent in terms of where he would like to live and which

⁷ All names are pseudonyms in order to protect the study participants' identity

community he feels a part of and comfortable in. When asked, “Do you feel close to the people here in Mexico? Or, “do you feel closer to the people in the U.S.,” Anthony answered, “here” [in Mexico]. On the other hand, Anthony states that he has little in common with the people in Mexico, feels closer to family both in Mexico and the U.S., but would choose Mexico if he had to pick between the two. Later in the interview, Anthony states that he would choose the U.S. school over Mexico’s school and wants to be a U.S. soldier when he grows up. This family’s story helps clarify that although individuals may feel that their local community is open to new migrants and is non-prejudiced, migrants’ feelings of belonging are directly tied with their experiences and comparisons they make to the U.S. At the age of 11, Anthony recognizes differences between school sizes, prestige (of occupations), and the importance of bringing tangible items back to Mexico and U.S. economic gains to make a stay and life more comfortable, “Buy a lot of shoes. And buy clothes long sleeve. And take some old clothes. Because sometimes they make you work here. And hmm...take money. That’s all. So they can waste it here. Buy whatever they want.”

Other individuals felt that local residents were prejudiced toward their family even before they arrived. As a single mother in Mexico, Selena left her three children in care of her mother in order to migrate to the United States in search of work to be able to support her children, remit enough to build her dream house in Mexico, and to rekindle her long distance marriage. During her time in the U.S., Selena became pregnant with a fourth child. Due to a lack of social support, high costs of childcare and medical needs in the United States, Selena made the journey to Mexico to drop off her U.S.-born child

with her mother. Reflecting on her circular migration experience, Selena explains how she felt perceived by the locals before her final return,

And despite everything, you know that people here are very, they like to talk a lot... because it does affect [me] you know but despite everything at times you show them [that] much more that you can [make it] – [compared to] another person... And it did upset me because they would tell my mom, ‘your daughter is going to bring you another child, and another, and another and you are going to take care of them’. They would give her ideas and my mom believed them at first but when she saw it was not true she stopped listening. But the people were not on my mind, I had another mentality and the people had another – a bad conception of me. What the people thought was not it, and sometimes that helps too because you say no, let me demonstrate to the people that I can [be better] and I am not like any other [loose woman] that they can speak badly of me. Especially being a single mom, which is when they want to bring you down...

Five years ago, Selena finished building her dream house in Mexico with the remittances she sent for 7 years – a home that was large enough for her four children. When she returned to the municipality, three of her four children came to live with her (including the U.S.-born child), but one decided to stay with the grandmother who had raised her. Now the community snickers at Selena for remarrying and bringing her new husband to live with her – something out of the ordinary in the local culture. The local culture tends to endorse more patriarchal/traditional ways of approaching gender norms. Men generally serve as the providers so it is customary for a married couple to live with the husband’s family although some exceptions may occur when the wife’s family has gifted a lot for the couple to build on; women take care the household and the children. Behind closed doors, husbands may help out with chores around the home. San Pedro returnees bring back more liberated gender roles, of which the local culture does not approve and may not be ready for. Feeling like an outsider because of traditional gender roles in the returning milieu was also found in another study that focused on British-

Caribbean women in other cases of return migration (Reynolds 2011). The rejection by one's homeland due to cultural remittances is also found among "Nuyoricans", who bring back new ways of dressing and language (Lorenzo- Hernández 1999).

Selena's story exemplifies how not all returnees face equal reception. Parents who are unable to fit with the local customs and have been away for too long may face discrimination and prejudice because of who they have become during their migration journey. Migration provides immigrants the ability to pursue economic, personal, and other ambitions/experiences but shapes individuals in the process. These multifaceted experiences lend migrants a unique perspective of the world and the ability to make comparisons between countries.

More than half of the families had strong opinions about how they viewed their small town upon return. Parents highlighted the change in values, culture, the corruption, the lack of authority, and the physical/commodity differences. Children emphasized the physical differences, lack of entertainment, and stores – a reflection of rural return migration (Ní Laoire 2007). Nancy, a 36 year old woman and mother of three U.S.-born children who resided in the U.S. for 12 years and self-identified as a voluntary returnee, elaborates on how her migrant experience shaped her view about returning,

At first we came here with the intention of staying, but as the time passes by and with the time we spent over there [in the US] we got accustomed, and now I think [return migration] is better only for vacation, but not to come live here. It's like you get accustomed to the commodities, the way of life there [in the US]. You do think of coming here but not to stay anymore.

When parent perceptions of how local community members received them were analyzed more closely, specifically by number of years spent away, those that were only gone five years or less all answered that their communities were nonprejudiced. Those

that spent between 6-10 years away felt their community was prejudiced, both prejudiced and unprejudiced, and not prejudiced (in that order). Those absent between 11-15 years felt their community was nonprejudiced but also had mixed feelings; those spending between 16-20 years away from San Pedro felt their communities were prejudiced or notprejudiced by not both. Lastly, the parent that had been away the longest (20+ years) felt prejudiced by the community. It is important to note that upon comparing excerpts of prejudice versus non-prejudice examples as a family, thirteen families considered their mixed-family arrival as not subjected to prejudiced and ten of those same families also provided examples of how their communities were prejudiced. The ten overlapping cases of prejudice/non-prejudice perceptions and instances where parents had mixed feelings, highlights how binary terms of modes of incorporation do not reflect true adaptation realities of mixed-nativity families in Mexico.

The following is an example of how local community members are both prejudiced and non-prejudiced toward a family. Johana and her husband decided to flee the U.S. with kids in tow because their attorney filed fraudulent paperwork to Department of Homeland Security without their knowledge and would soon be deported. In addition, her husband's mother was not doing well health wise. Johana explains her arrival and how her community was positively receptive of her coming home,

People still talked to me when I returned and I would go out in the afternoons when we had nothing to do and would go out and all the people would invite us 'come have some coffee, come get a drink.'

However, Johana did not anticipate her child to be bullied by other community children. Emily, Johana's 11-year-old daughter, broke down when I asked about how she

felt about moving to Mexico because the children in town make her feel unwelcome.

Emily shares her story about having only one friend,

I only have one friend. Many are mad at me because I was born over there on the other side, but now I hold it in, but there are some that understand me and they do not put me to the side like the rest...she is the only friend that I have [she says crying], but I also wonder, “why do I need more?”

This excerpt raises an important point about who is targeted by this prejudice.

Since the local community is of the mestizo race, then one would expect that locals would be accepting of U.S.-born children, since they are born to Mexican parents. U.S.-born children are similar to San Pedro community members in physical appearance, class background, language, and religion (Portes and Rumbaut 2001). Yet, San Pedro community members are prejudiced toward U.S.-born children but not their parents. The only difference between the two is the geography of where the child was born so nationality/citizenship may be the root of the prejudice. The phenotypical reference group is therefore a person of mestizo race who was born in Mexico, not simply a mestizo. The prejudices towards newcomers mirror the experiences of first generation immigrants in the U.S. (like the parents of the children in this study) but in reverse; the children in this study are “American” enough that their peers see them as outsiders or less acculturated, while their parents are Mexican enough for the community. This nativism extends beyond this level of incorporation and is also reflected in Mexico’s immigration laws and policies which grants Mexico-born individuals full birthrights, while naturalized citizens are granted second-class citizenship (Medina and Menjívar 2015). The nativism in local communities merges with Mexico’s overall efforts to control immigration flows (Gonzalez-Murphy and Koslowski 2011).

Seeing the problems associated with her child's incorporation leads Johana to have mixed feelings about returning and her family being welcome. This exemplifies why it is important to consider both parent and child in understanding how these mixed-nativity families are adapting in Mexico. Between the tears of recalling her family's return, Johana elaborates,

It was difficult because like I mention it was that they played jokes on the kids, but a lot and I would complain to the teachers and one time I believe they tied Emily's hair to the chair, since she had it long (her hair to her backpack)...and when she tried to get up the chair went too. And she also has the habit of taking off a shoe and I think they took her shoe from underneath and would throw it on the azotea (roof). So she would come crying from the things they would tell her, they hit her one time, she said a boy named Juan spit in her food too.

When children's integration is analyzed separately⁸⁹, findings show that U.S.-born children face heightened challenges with the local community. All children felt their communities were prejudiced. More answered that communities were prejudiced while the rest felt locals were both prejudiced and nonprejudiced. Local community members, such as Mexican-born peers and teachers specifically were unwelcoming and prejudiced. A teenager named Kevin, enjoyed Mexico's scenery but felt negatively about the community. The soft-spoken boy expressed his distaste of the people in his host community, "they are *criticonas* (like to criticize)." Locals have called him lanky, *Mogly* (mosquito), and *chango* (monkey). Kevin does not feel well liked by the people and feels

⁸ Only 7 of the 10 children responded to the question about community integration.

⁹ Due to the fact that children are U.S.-born, their perceptions cannot be analyzed in terms of "time away." When analyzing child perceptions by parental time away, those with parents that had been gone for less than five years perceived their communities as both prejudiced and not prejudiced. Those with parents away between 6-10 years perceived their communities as prejudiced and both. No children responded to the community perceptions with parents gone between 11-15 years. Children with parents gone between 16-20 years responded that community members were prejudiced and both. Those with parents gone away for more than 20 years indicated their community was prejudiced.

they are *muy llevados* (people that cross the boundaries) and *groseros* (rude). Kevin's father, Juan expanded on their children's challenges in adapting,

It may be because, we also always have held back a bit about going from house to house and over there. I think this is why it can be said that they [U.S. children] may not feel okay here because it is a different system of life well, so society or the community in some way they shelter themselves too because sometimes I hear them talk to other people and they ask what that signifies and well no, they do not know [it] well, them [know] Spanish –no.

For others, the children's language barrier prevented them from being able to interact with peers in and out of school. Parents pleaded with local municipality educators to have patience with their U.S.-born children because they lacked Spanish language skills. Nancy, a concerned mother, had gone to the extent of enrolling her son, Victor, in Spanish tutoring prior to the start of the school year to ease her child's transition.

Right now, I am sending him to Spanish classes because he does not know how to speak it, speak yes but write it no, but to write and read he does not know. So I am sending him to Spanish classes, and he said he made two friends, but that he does not like living here.

The language adjustments children in this study face also resemble the challenges of the first generation cohorts in the U.S. since the use of a second language at home can negatively influence educational outcomes (Crosnoe 2014). The same holds true today for foreign children in central Mexico, and these findings parallel to what other U.S.-born children are facing in other areas of Mexico (Zúñiga and Hamann 2009, 2014). Zuniga and Hamann found that 26% of US- born children in Mexico have repeated a grade and were behind in Spanish (2009).

As a consequence of not being able to successfully integrate linguistically, 14-year-old Stephanie dropped out of *la secundaria* (middle school). Stephanie had become

bored because “she flunked all her *materias* (courses) and had to repeat the grade,” according to her mother Esperanza. When I asked Stephanie about whether or not she wanted to return to school she quickly replied, “Not here. I wanted to go back [but] I don’t want to go here.” If classes were in English she would reconsider, but for now, she would not. Outside of school, Stephanie and Esperanza felt that their family was adapting well and that their community was non-prejudiced. Yet, actual reception may be different. Other community members thought that the customs Esperanza’s family brought with them from the U.S. were different and pointless, like the stroller Stephanie and her older sister pushed on cobblestone streets. The local custom is to carry a child in a *rebozo* (shawl/wrap) and while some streets have sidewalks, the town has steep hills which makes it difficult to push a stroller. Stephanie’s language impediment has also resulted in a nickname being assigned to her. The differences between the family’s own perceptions and actual reception may suggest returnees may not answer truthfully about their migration experiences because they fear being judged. The inconsistency also highlights the limitations of relying on observations (or in this case, the public’s reports) of how returnees are integrating and the importance of including migrants’ individual perceptions of whether or not problems are experienced at all (Agozino 2000).

Selena, Johana, and Juan’s stories reflect the anti-newcomer attitudes in Mexico, the social environments children must face when migrating to their parents’ home country, and lack of community support and understanding of the migrant/home experiences. U.S.-born children are the direct targets of discrimination and prejudice. Other intergenerational returnees have had similar experiences in other contexts as well. For instance, second and third generation Japanese-Brazilians “returning” to Japan have

experienced disaffection from their ethnic homeland (Takeyuki Tsuda 2003; Tsuda 2004). Other groups have faced rejection and disillusion of how their arrival would be (Conway 2005; Ní Laoire 2007). Some British-Caribbean youth have treated their migration a short term solution to obtaining instrumental support (Reynolds 2011). Children in this sample expressed strong opinions about wanting to return to their homeland to visit friends, to shop, to finish their studies, and longings of return (Moran-Taylor and Menjivar 2005). The social integration findings in San Pedro parallel the aforementioned studies in terms of how children are received, but they are also reflective of the structural barriers to integration on both sides of the border, an issue that previous social reception literature does not address. Both children and parents were aware of the child's U.S. citizenship and how it could facilitate future U.S.-bound migrations for the child when they come of age or when they couldn't take their new context of return. Parents were protective of their child's legal status, shared their worries about following proper immigration procedures in Mexico, and said they would not deny their child their birthrights if their children ever decided to leave Mexico.

The challenges that mixed-nativity families face go beyond the modes of the incorporation theoretical framework. The assimilation framework is ideal for gaging avenues through which immigrants incorporate but it is designed for analyzing psychological outcomes. The psychological impacts of coming to terms with the international relocation are an area that needs to be further explored in future return migration studies. Victor's emotional and psychological trauma and inability to cope with his migration was well beyond the scope of this study. The child became silent when I greeted him and tears trickled down Victor's face when his mother explained to me that

her child was homesick, was having difficulty adjusting to his new home, and that the physical separation from his father, who was in the process of joining them, was taking a toll on him. The mother shared the same sentiments and emotions and regretted her and her husband's decision to return to Mexico. These are often decisions that parents make without considering their children's country of preference (Djajić 2008). In fact, parent and child feelings in this family may be reflective of psychiatric implications of displacement (Fullilove 1996)¹⁰.

In order to analyze the integration experiences of children, parents' experiences must also be considered. Mexican national parents are affected by societal prejudices against their children, similar to how U.S.-born children are affected by increasingly restrictive immigration policies that target their undocumented parents in the U.S. Therefore, this study, focusing on mixed-nativity families, must consider individual, societal, governmental policies and the interactions between these subsystems as illustrated by the stories of mixed-nativity families.

Reception by Immediate and Extended Family

The social support that immigrants' social networks provide is well documented (Dreby 2010; Reynolds 2011). In this section, I build on previous work (Medina 2011) to illustrate how relatives of the returning migrants play a major role in how mixed-nativity families perceive their reception among extended and immediate family. Findings indicate that most returnees and their foreign born children felt well received and that their kinfolk were not prejudiced. However, some cases of prejudices by family members toward these families do exist as this section will point out.

¹⁰ This theory posits that individuals need a good environment requires a bond between a person and a place, familiarity of their environs, and a sense of self.

Fifteen year old Amanda, explains how the community received her and her family,

Some people were happy you know. [laughs] I guess it's all family. And they welcomed us back. I remember when we got here, everyone kept coming by. Oh you guys are back, that's good you know... Like for the first month. Sometimes when we walk to [the soccer] games, we see people, 'oh how are you, how have you been?' I feel like a huge welcome from everybody.

As formally found, place attachment is crucial to feeling 'at home' (Medina 2011). When asked where she calls home, Amanda responded "Wichita" but also said she could also call San Pedro "home", because of the extended family members around but lacked in the United States. This coincides with parents sharing that their children are "happy to see their grandparents, their cousins, their uncles, meeting, some would come, others would leave and 'this is your uncle' - because here he has lots of family." The U.S.-born children's perception of positive, non-prejudiced reception from their family was salient throughout the narratives.

Jose, a 15-year-old teenager, expressed a sense of relief about attending the same school as his cousins. Jose and his nostalgic parents moved to Mexico in 2006 after wanting to live in the new house that they built with remittances. Although Jose's parents had a strong desire to return, Jose's parents did not have the proper legal status to reside in the U.S. and built the house because they feared deportation. When Jose attempted to walk home from school by himself for the first time in San Pedro, Jose accidentally took a wrong turn and ended up in the opposite side of town. A cousin recognized Jose and noticed that he might be lost. The cousin walked him home that day and did so for the rest of the school year. This example highlights how families and friends are often the providers of information about the home country (Tiemoko 2004). More importantly,

Jose's mistake highlights how his cousin was the bridge between Jose and his way home and how important the role of a parent is in child migration. Jose's parents facilitated an introduction between Jose and his cousin. Without it, Jose would have been lost in town without a way home.

Parents also felt the same welcome from their immediate and extended family upon their return at a glance. Yolanda explained her family's return,

Again we assimilated again, our family received us well, our acquaintances... would say "welcome, welcome"...well thanks, "welcome again to the town" ...yes all the people received us well but our family more, they were happy that we had returned. My father was elated because one day he came to visit here and Pedro was over here and he said, 'its great kids, that you found me with life still,' he said. Since he used to come over here a lot [before] he often stopped by to see his grandchildren and was sad when we left but now that we returned he is really happy.

Yolanda's story highlights that her parents were happy to have Yolanda and her Mexican-born children that he knew so well back home. Although this chapter does not focus on the Mexican-born child returnees, other Mexican national children received similar greetings and seemed to have an easier time in fitting back into to their old communities. The children seemed to pick up where they left off in Mexico life.

Other returning migrants also described their relatives as being *contentisimos* (happy) when they returned. Angelica, a 32 year old U.S. housekeeper turned meat merchant upon returning to Mexico, described how her immediate family wanted to impress the U.S.-born children with a present and gifted her child with a hamster. These small gestures made Angelica and her mixed-nativity family, feel very welcome. This example highlights how extended families also make an effort to include child newcomers.

However, not all returning migrants experienced a positive welcome. Juan, a 46-year-old man that migrated to the United States when he was 22 years old, had no formal education but had managed to be economically successful in the United States. He sent remittances to Mexico and had built himself a brick house on a mountainside lot that his parents had promised to him. While he was away in the United States, Juan's parents sold part of the lot and never told Juan, even though he was under the impression that the lot was entirely his and was already building a house on it. Juan's immediate family relationship was clouded and frail due to the property issue and Juan felt his family was attempting to take advantage of his economic success and kindness. Juan explained the negative family relationships and how he felt that his relatives turned against him. "We do not get along. I don't have any 'family'. You know very well, [how it goes] here -- if you don't let someone borrow money, they are no longer your family and they do not want you." As a result of this family fight, Juan's three U.S.-born children have met some relatives but hardly speak to any. This illustrates how a prejudiced context may shape the way individuals are able to establish or deploy social capital (Portes and Rumbaut 2001). Unfriendly and negative relationships like this one hinders the support system that would otherwise exist upon the Mexican national's return. Furthermore, this lack of family support may limit the social capital that U.S.-born children can build in their new host country (Reynolds 2011).

Although Juan's case was one of the most extreme cases of fragmented family relationships and an exception in this sample, this illustrates what happens to family relationships when so much time, milestones, and events have passed. Yet family discord is one of the most common difficulties returnees have (Tiemoko 2004). Juan's story also

highlights that phone contact cannot replace face-to-face contact, despite what some argue about contact and remittances enabling strong ties.

When time away was considered in parental perceptions of how they felt received by their immediate and extended families, I found that the majority of parents felt well received and nonprejudiced by their family. Parents that had been away from San Pedro for less than five years all responded that they were well received and their communities were nonprejudiced. Those away between 6-10 years had mixed feelings and or felt their families were nonprejudiced respectively. Those absent between 11-15 years felt their family was either prejudiced or nonprejudiced but not both. For those that had been away for lengthier periods (16-20), parents felt their communities were nonprejudiced or had mixed feelings. The one parent that had been away the longest (20+ years), felt that the immediate and extended family was simply prejudiced. The variation between those that were absent from San Pedro between 6-20 years, highlights that a portion of parents had mixed feelings about how their immediate and extended families received them.

Nancy, a woman who had recently returned to Mexico after being gone for 12 years, also did not feel well received from her immediate family. Throughout the time that they were away, she and her husband romanticized about returning, only to face a cold shoulder from her family.

I don't know what happened I tell you I don't know. Maybe they recalled that I had been away a long time, I felt like they were still mad or like they were still hurt but I really think that it was because it had been a long time and that I was not there with my dad when my father died, yes...one would like to be in good circumstances with all your family, with all my, with all the world, but if one is on good terms with the family and with the rest of the people one feels much better.

As previously found, migration periods appear to impact family bonds (Medina 2011). To Nancy, migrating was not worth the lost time and severed kinfolk connections. The wounded relationships were one of several reasons why Nancy regretted making the move back to Mexico. Nancy may not feel the sense of family or belonging in Mexico (Tiemoko 2004) because her children are not adapting. She is willing to sacrifice herself for her children's wellbeing, even if that means returning to the U.S.

Families shared more stories of their immediate and extended families being nonprejudiced and welcoming, more often than not. For those who experienced prejudice and unwelcoming sentiments from their families, the four mixed-nativity families demonstrate that not all returns are identical. Indeed, the degrees of family relationships and the impact of migration on families that stay behind are also factors that determine the return migration adjustment process. This parallels with other studies that show variations of social support both in the U.S. and Mexico (Dreby 2010; Henry 2006; Menjívar 2000; Reynolds 2011; Takeyuki Tsuda 2003). In these studies, social networks were bound by resources and support they could provide which hindered migrant adaptation and relationships.

Discussion and Conclusion

This chapter focuses on how return migrants and their foreign children are integrating into Mexico society. By applying Portes and Zhou's (Portes and Zhou 1993) framework to return migration and modifying the layers of what constitutes a society, to account for immediate and extended family and the local community, this study suggests that binary outcomes regarding social integration are unrealistic in terms of what actually takes place.

When returnee re-integration and foreign child integrations are analyzed simultaneously within the scope of *local community (non-immediate and extended family)* reception, findings vary. Particularly with how families, parents, and children feel they are received and if these experiences constitute non-prejudice or prejudiced actions on behalf of the local community. Children's stories varied as to whether or not they perceived their host community to be prejudiced or not. Most children however, experienced prejudice from their peers. Although some parents felt well received and their home community as non-prejudiced toward their family, others experienced prejudice and other variations of rejection. Parents were observant of how the community treated their children and this also impacted how they perceived their overall return, prejudices of society, and wellbeing.

This analysis provides new insight on the concurrent integration patterns of mixed-nativity families and highlights how binary "adaptations" do not work in the cases of *immediate and extended family* reception as well. In some cases, adult returnees felt withdrawn from their immediate/extended families and felt that they were better received by the larger community. Their physical and emotional absence from their families made their returns more difficult and their children's integration experiences emotionally affected them. Children were grateful for having extended family and cousins in their host society. Extended family helped facilitate new interactions with other locals, were providers of information, and played the role of friends as well.

These differential patterns illustrate the burdens of migration (Dreby 2012). Their parents and other individuals, who had former lives in Mexico, experienced more variation in their feelings of family reception. Their time away from their home country

changed their relationships, modified their family dynamics, and were no longer perceived the same by their relatives and vice versa. Parents with short migrations (<5 years) felt well perceived and nonprejudiced by both local community members and family. On the other extreme, those absent longer than 20+ years felt they were not well received and that both community members and family were prejudiced towards their family. This is expected as migrants are changed by their migration experiences and where they lived (Guarnizo 1996). Further analyses should focus on prior relationships before migration to see if that has any effect on how return migrants have seen an actual change. Longitudinal studies are ideal because they can measure changes in language, social network, mental health, and general migrant well-being.

Furthermore, these different patterns of integration raise broader questions about the treatment of these returnees and their foreign-born children. Is prejudice towards foreign children, regardless of their legal citizenship, an early sign of anti-immigration sentiment in Mexico? Will these anti-immigration attitudes perpetuate a second-class citizenry through children's social exclusion in Mexico? Will children's integration in Mexican society resemble the integration patterns that their parents may have experienced in the United States?

CHAPTER 4

NATIONAL IDENTITY POST RETURN MIGRATION

Introduction

National identity has been described as the intensity and type of relationship towards a nation or geographical area (Carey 2002). National identity can also refer to the degree to which an individual has positive attachments to his/her nation (Tajfel 1981). Since national identity also serves as a political unit in forming alliances and shapes voting behaviors (Schildkraut 2005), countries are especially interested in the national identity of foreigners. Moving away from conventional understandings of national identity, others classify national identity with cultural identity (Sabatier 2008), bond, or sense of community (Theiss-Morse 2009). Since ‘statelessness’ leaves people without a community, it is of international concern (Cook-Martin 2013).

This chapter takes a unique approach by focusing on the national identity of families that have spent numerous years in the U.S. and have now returned to Mexico. Return migration experiences have been relatively ignored but as the growing number of foreign U.S.-born children migrate with their parents to Mexico, the subject is garnering attention (Krogstad 2016). Similar to Latino immigrants not fitting into one racial/ethnic category (Collins 2001) in the U.S., mixed-status children are not expected to fit into one neat national identity category in Mexico either. For example, U.S.-born children are classified as “return” migrants when they have never lived or been to Mexico (Zúñiga and Hamann 2006). Yet, Mexican immigrants and their U.S.-born children are a growing population and data on their incorporation is sparse. This piece therefore fills the literature gap in immigrant incorporation, nationalism, and citizenship studies.

Despite the growing work on returnees (Gonzalez and Zúñiga 2014; Valdez-Gardea 2012; Zúñiga and Hamann 2009, 2014) and deportees (Anderson 2013) in Mexico, research is limited to families with multiple citizenships living together as a family unit. When they do, the majority of studies focus on the normalized transnational family, families left behind (Dreby 2010), and children's experiences in Mexico's schools (Gonzalez and Zúñiga 2014; Valdez-Gardea 2012).

Analyzing nationalism from the outside looking in is fruitful for explaining power and politics with noncitizen populations (Koch 2015) because we get a different view of how the nation state influences and immigrant integration patterns. In the following section, I review the national identity literature on Mexicans in the U.S. and Mexico. I then cover methodology and present my findings on how mixed-status families make sense of their national identity when they (re)migrate to Mexico.

National Identity of Mexicans

Although Mexicans may reside in all parts of the world, this section focuses on Mexicans in the U.S. and Mexico. I draw on literature from the U.S. because the families in this study contain members with U.S. nativity. Within U.S. scholarship, literature pertaining to the national identity of Latinos has focused on the "Americanness" of individuals (Collins 2001). 'Latinos' in this analysis refers to Mexican immigrants from a U.S. perspective, who were interviewed in this chapter. Many Latino Americans are not viewed as American as their Caucasian American counterparts in the U.S. (Devos, Gavin, and Quintana 2010), have various levels of marginalization, and may not be given the same benefits of group membership (Theiss-Morse 2009). According to Theiss-Morse (2009), group commitment level and their boundaries are important aspects of national

identity. Individuals can be born into a national group, but how committed they feel to it can influence their attitudes and behaviors. National identity is also shaped by perceptions of parental relationships, parental enculturation, and perceived discrimination (Sabatier 2008). Further, immigrants' sense of national belonging can be explained by how inclusive national identity is defined in that particular country and if it really is attainable, as well as the extent to which citizenship rights exclude immigrants (Simonsen 2015).

Racial categories exemplify how the citizenship status of non-whites is contested (Collins 2001). As Collins argues, the U.S. workings between race, ethnicity, and U.S. national identity actually promote ethnic nationalism, based on bloodlines promoting white purity (Collins 2001). For example, Operation Wetback in the 1950's targeted Mexicans and many, including U.S. citizens, were repatriated (Flores 2003). More recently, Arizona State Senate Bill 1070 allowed the racial profiling of individuals. One reason for the streak of anti-immigrant legislations is large immigration patterns and population shifts which threaten places with homogeneous populations (Bloemraad 2000). Nonetheless, individuals can claim U.S. national identity without having actual registered citizenship, or as Koch argues, non-citizens can invoke nationalism (Koch 2015).

Recent studies have recognized that the concept of citizenship moves beyond legal status and can be viewed as an individual possession of fundamental rights and the experience of identity and solidarity (Staton, Jackson, and Canache 2007), and it is often more productive to focus on how individuals imagine and implement the criteria for inclusion and exclusion (Koch 2015). Cook-Martin (2013) argues that citizenship matters

because changes to the link between people and the state also shapes people's relationship to the nation, civil society and markets. Daily life as an immigrant also requires a transnational lens on citizenship so we can observe the simultaneous dynamics of multiple senses of belonging and participation (Bloemraad 2006).

In cases of dual citizenship, where individuals are attached to two countries, their national identity is questioned because it assumes commitment to one specific group and/or country. Immigrants challenge notions of citizenship by participating in global economic systems, home country politics, global economic systems and social spaces, and movements (Bloemraad 2000). Some argue that dual nationals are less likely than sole-U.S. nationals to be proficient in English (an overly used indicator of being American), to identify with the United States, and be connected to American polity when political connectedness is defined as skills, attitudes, and behaviors attaching an individual to the political system (Staton et al. 2007). Although the U.S. recognizes but does not encourage dual citizenship (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering 2015), becoming naturalized in the U.S. is an indicator of successful integration (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering 2015). Given that national identity is a strand of citizenship (Bosniak 2006), this chapter utilizes a citizenship studies perspective to interpret immigrant sense of belonging or nationalism of the mixed-status families now living in Mexico.

Citizenship studies focus on four dimensions: legal status, rights, participation and sense of belonging or identity (Bloemraad 2000, 2006). Under traditional models, legal status demands a relationship between the citizen and the country but migration complicates this relationship. Within the first dimension of legal status, birthright

citizenship, naturalization, complex policies, and methodologies are debated (Bloemraad 2000). Within the second dimension of rights, social rights are introduced, control and morals are argued. The third dimension of participation revolves around how immigrants vote, participate in associations or even volunteer (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering 2015). Participation is a direct measure of how immigrants are involved within their social contexts (Bloemraad 2006) and are integrating (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering 2015). Civic engagement trickles up in mixed-status families, as children connect their parents to institution, develops their sense of belonging and provides paths for integration for other family members (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering 2015). The last dimension revolves around sense of belonging or identity. This chapter hones in on the identity dimension, with some references on engagement.

Bloemraad argues that identity is the link between membership and the State (Bloemraad 2006). This chapter takes on the position that immigrants can maintain transnational and multiple citizenships but core dimensions of citizenship remain salient (Bloemraad 2006). A *cultural citizenship* framework is put forward to assist in explaining the national identity of families with blended citizenship statuses but who live in Mexico due to circumstances beyond their control. Rosaldo (1994) describes cultural citizenship as the right to be unlike and still belong in a participatory democratic sense. Cultural citizenship takes place regardless of differences in race, religion, class, gender and sexual orientation. Further, a cultural citizenship framework highlights how minorities claim spaces and recognizes that people have different understandings of given situations and make claims to citizenship on the basis of their social position (Rosaldo 1997). Ong et al.

(1996) have applied cultural citizenship to Cambodian refugees and Chinese cosmopolitans to explore meanings of citizenship, finding that their racialization as Asians differentiates their citizenship worth. Dynamic racial othering emerges differently for wealthy Chinese who are ‘whitened’ and so Ong et al. argue that the Asian American category must acknowledge the class, ethnic, and racial stratifications that occur when governments work with two populations (Ong et al. 1996).

Although scholars have applied the cultural citizenship framework to Latinos within the U.S. (Rosaldo 1994, 1997), to date, this theory is seldom applied to individuals living outside of the U.S. I therefore examine the national identity of mixed-nativity families in Mexico by focusing on how Mexican national parents and U.S.-born children describe their sense of belonging after residing in the U.S. for some time. By comparing and contrasting both groups, I am able to make sense if national identity varies by place of birth.

Methods and Data

Data in this analysis stems from a larger study focusing on return migration, education, community reception, and identity (Medina and Menjívar 2015). A purposive approach was utilized to conduct semi-structured interviews in 2010. Mixed-status families were recruited and 23 individuals (N=23) were interviewed. The sample consisted of 13 adults and 10 children. The sample criteria involved recruiting adults (18 + years old) with at least one child (ages 6-17) from mixed-nativity families. Selection criteria were based on age, nativity, gender, and remigration date. Interviews were conducted in the interviewees’ language of choice (English, Spanish, or both).

The children in this sample were 12 years old on average and were born in six different states (California, Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, Virginia, Washington). Adults averaged 36 years of age and were from three states in Mexico (Jalisco, Morelos, State of Mexico). Four families had U.S.-born children only, while nine families were mixed-status. Families lived in seven different states (Arizona, California, Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, Virginia, Washington) prior to returning to Mexico. They returned for a variety of reasons, including: a desire to not live in the U.S., unemployment, forced return, the need to care for a family member, as a strategy to keep the family together, as a means of exposing children to Mexican values, out of fear of deportation, and attorney fraud.

Interviews were transcribed and entered into MAXQDA, a text analysis software, where a qualitative analysis was conducted. To identify how parents and mixed-status children felt regarding their national identity, I coded responses to the question, “Do you feel close to the people from San Pedro or more with the people from where you lived before in the U.S.?” into a broad identity code. In an effort to be more inclusive as (Koch 2015) calls for, I steered away from dichotomizing either feeling connected to the U.S. or Mexico in this analysis. From the broad identity code answers, “citizenship” and “nationality” subcodes emerged and were examined. I then further examined what parents considered their children’s national identity to be, child responses to identity questions, and parent responses to identity questions.

National Identity is Fluid

Reading through the stories, it became immediately apparent that Mexican nationals used the terms ‘citizenship’ and ‘nationality’ interchangeably. I rely on the rich immigration histories and experiences to interpret how once U.S. residents (in a physical

sense) feel about their attachment to a place or affective sentiments (Bloemraad 2000). I find that there are no differences between how parents and children feel about their national identity, as both groups identify as American despite parents lacking formal U.S. citizenship (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering 2015; Rosaldo 1994).

Children's nationality through the eyes of parents

Due to the fact that children develop a sense of who they are through their parents or immediate environments (Bronfenbrenner and Morris 2006), this section focuses on how parents interpret their U.S.-born children's notions of national identity. This also assists in corroborating what the children have reported as well. I find that U.S.-born children born to Mexican nationals are seen as 'American' for all purposes. This identity crosses borders and U.S. citizenship remains a focal point for the cases of return migrants. Similar to Japanese Brazilians (T Tsuda 2003), these families hold onto their child's American national identity.

Parents explain their child's nationality identity in terms of being and 'Americans' and 'dual citizens'. By doing so, they are creating multiple sites of citizenship and extending our knowledge of current developments in citizenship studies (Bosniak 2002). Furthermore, the language that is used tips the conventional terms of citizenship and nationality on their head. It was quite common for parents to specify the child's birthplace or even refer to them as "Hispanic-Americans," a term that is generally used in the U.S. which is normally the host society. Yet parents use the same term to refer to their children in Mexico, a second location, thus amplifying not only their citizenship like Bosniak contends (2002), but also their nationality.

Selena's story illustrates how parents classify their children who were born in the U.S. Selena is a 38 year old mother of four and is a recent arrival. Her story is unique because Selena brought her U.S.-born daughter Yesenia to live in Mexico at the age of one during her circular migration patterns. Although Yesenia has birthright citizenship and has legal status to live in the U.S. among numerous other advantages (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering 2015), she has lived in Mexico almost her entire life. Yesenia was too young to recall her birthplace during the interview and had trouble expressing what country she identified with, yet her mother classified Yesenia's national identity as being American. Selena believes her youngest child is American and not Mexican:

[My child is American] because she was born over there...in Georgia [USA], and well...when I speak about her, I remember her birth.

Selena associates birthright citizenship or in this case, U.S. citizenship to being American or national identity (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering 2015), regardless of where she has been raised the majority of her life. This contrasts with experiences of the DREAMers who identify as "American" or claim the U.S. as their home because this is where they were raised (Anderson and Solis 2014). Yesenia's case highlights the various meanings of what 'Americanness' is. Selena uses the term "American" to embody nationality as well as a geographical point that is intertwined with memories.

The mere memory of birthing U.S.-born children brings nostalgia to parents in Mexico. Children are living relics of parental migration stories, whether positive or negative. In another case, Yolanda, a 48 year old mother admits her U.S.-born daughter is her favorite. Yolanda's family returned to San Pedro out of fear of being deported. Her

husband was caught driving a vehicle under the influence of alcohol and the family opted to return to San Pedro out of fears of getting deported. Yolanda preferred to stay in the U.S. and was willing to make financial sacrifices so that she and the children could remain in the U.S. She determines, “The [U.S.-born] girl I would say is Mexican-American.”

Similarly, Mario is a father of three daughters, two of whom are U.S.-born. Mario has come to terms that his daughters have developed their own sense of connection to the U.S. Mario relocated his family when he decided that he did not want the State overseeing his parenting. Mario explains, “*Well my girls were born over there [in the U.S.]...and they also say so as well...haha.*” The U.S.-born daughters claim their U.S. national identity despite their geographical distance from the U.S., thus extending the concept of citizenship beyond ordinary borders (Bloemraad 2000; Cook-Martin 2013). However, to what extent this exercising of citizenship from afar and transnational nature remains to be seen.

Due to the fact that their children were born in the U.S., Mexican national parents view their children as Americans or both but not solely as Mexican nationals. This is important because the cultural citizenship framework assumes that the immigrant, in this case the U.S.-born child in Mexico or foreigner, will feel close or have strong feelings toward their host society. In the case of U.S.-born children, children do not identify with Mexican nationals and they hold on to their “Americanness”. The cultural citizenship framework then does not fit the lives of mixed-status families living in Mexico and this point requires a new theory to capture these new migration experiences. U.S.-born

children do not envision themselves as members of Mexican society and Mexico's larger nation state effort in receiving *paisanos* with open arms is contradictory with the actual local reception (chapter three). One reason may be that Mexican nationals and subsequent generations desire to fit into mainstream society and be accepted in the U.S. In Mexico, U.S.-born children are still developing their sense of self, and they emphasize the only identity they have ever known or base their identity on what birth certificate says— their American identity. Their American passports and U.S. birth certificates are also concrete expressions of what nation state claims them (Cook-Martin 2013).

Furthermore, anti-foreigner sentiments in Mexico may push U.S.-born children to feel closer to the U.S. than Mexico, especially in cases where children do not have required foreigner cards (Medina and Menjivar 2015). The absence of legal status may pose risks in being unable to incorporate into social institutions such as schools (Medina and Menjivar 2015). Their social integration within the community (Chapter 3) can also make it difficult to incorporate into the local society. It is not surprising then that parents who care and oversee their child's well-being view their child as American. Within this context, being 'American' also implies a person of privilege, with papers, and the ability to cross borders. In this sense, parents are emphasizing their child's agency of being able to come and go. Since agency is fundamental in immigrants taking an active role in citizenship (Bloemraad 2006), parents are reinforcing their child's identity and participating for them. In a way, parents can also be seen as the caregivers and mediators of their transnationalism (Bloemraad 2006) until they become their own agents or child migrants.

Furthermore, parents also teach U.S.-born children how to navigate their agency. Mario's two U.S.-born children migrated at a very young age to Mexico. Their national identity and U.S. citizenship is brought up during family interactions. Privately, Mario explained how he hopes that his daughters will 'fix' their youngest sibling's legal status so that she can also have American citizenship. While Mario would love to see the U.S. again legally, he prefers that his daughters use their citizenship to legalize their youngest sister's status.⁵

Well they say, "We are *pochas* (a Mexican-American with limited Spanish)." They say, "You're the only one [youngest child]," they tell her, "You're Mexican, but we're also going to make you from over there too."

There are two items worth noting from the citation above. First, Mario's daughters are claiming the *pocha* term which is usually seen as a derogatory term. By using the term themselves, they are undermining its offensive nature. Second, the daughters are acknowledging their privilege of being able to regulate their sisters' status. By doing both, they are resisting not only societal norms, but legal forces that shape their family.

Agency however, can also be considered ethnocentrism in Mexico because it shows preference towards U.S. national identity but not Mexican identity. The effects of not identifying or being "Mexican enough" can be seen in other works concerning U.S.-born children and U.S.-school children that are now living in Mexico. In these cases, educators believed these children did not value Mexican history and the Spanish language because they did not perform according to their standards (Zúñiga and Hamann 2009).

Through their own child eyes

Despite some variation when asked to explain what country they felt closest to, almost all children saw themselves as ‘Americans’ and emphasized their birthplace/borders/citizenship despite some possessing dual citizenship. For example, Stephanie, along with her 19 year old sister, and brother came to live in San Pedro in 2008. Stephanie and her brother are U.S.-born, but her older sister is Mexican-born. Her mother Esperanza has had trouble maintaining them enrolled in school because they do not have the appropriate foreigner cards required and their extension waiver has expired. Although the family is enjoying their stay in San Pedro, Stephanie wishes she could return to study in the U.S. because she has performed poorly in her classes. Stephanie has trouble speaking in Spanish and felt more comfortable speaking in English during the interview. Stephanie explains introductions in San Pedro,

A lot of people you see when they introduce themselves to you, they ask you where you are from- I say I was born in the United States.

Stephanie’s expression of wanting to return to the U.S. may be indicative of the particular challenges she has faced in enrolling in school. Lacking appropriate paperwork, Stephanie is unable to attend classes in Mexico like many other youth that have returned to Mexico due to the government’s inadequate response to returning and deported citizens (Anderson 2013).

In another area of town, fifteen-year-old Jose was born in Chicago and returned with his parents and two younger U.S.-born siblings to San Pedro in 2006. According to his mother Marta, the family wanted to return to her husband’s birthplace. The children were indifferent in returning to Mexico but have trouble acclimating themselves and getting around in town. Jose’s mother, Marta, explains their dialogue of nationality.

“Well I tell them ‘you are Mexican’ hahaha...and they say ‘We are American-Mexicans.’

The term Mexican-American is tipped on its head when Jose uses the term American-Mexican. This term comes up throughout the interviews across families. Although the quotes above represent how children identify, it also raises the question as to whether or not these identities are intensified as a consequence of local reception. Stephanie for example, has a nickname due to her inability to speak Spanish and Jose does not have any friends in town. Children’s identities appear to be solidified by their immediate environments.

The third case is that of Juan’s family. Juan, a 46 year old father of three U.S.-born children, returned to Mexico in 2005 quite abruptly after his wife’s immigration case was denied. The wife’s immigration hearing was in Mexico at the U.S. consulate, and when it was denied they had no other choice than stay in Mexico to remain united as a family. At the time of the interview, the family had been in Mexico for five years. Despite their U.S. passports, Juan is adamant that they are Mexican nationals. However, the children who remain connected to the U.S. clarify, *“Yeah! We are American-Mexican!”*

Throughout the interview, Juan emphasized his hard work, success, and religiosity. It appears that Juan attempts to bring humor into this answer but knows the reality that his children do not fit into Mexican society. They lack appropriate documentation to remain enrolled in school and the family has already decided the children will no longer attend classes at a school where the teachers do not know proper English. Their vast experience in U.S. schools provides them with an

advantage over teachers who are not fluent in English. This along with other range of factors, such as age appropriateness and proficiency play a role in schooling gaps (Menken, Kleyn, and Chae 2012). In fact, these transnational children often face difficulty in their language development and content learning, and experience academic isolation (Menken et al. 2012).

As mentioned earlier, the U.S.-born children also recapture their national identity by the language they use and when they practice their English. Unfortunately, their monolingual skills may dwindle as there are not many other English speakers. As their English skills threaten teachers as these monolingual children correct their English, these incidents may be early signs of transnational schooling challenges found elsewhere (Gonzalez and Zúñiga 2014; Menken et al. 2012).

The word choice and order of the term American-Mexican versus Mexican-American is important to point out within this section. Rather than call themselves Mexican-American like many U.S.-born citizens of Mexican descent in the U.S., the children recognize that they are U.S.-born and choose to primarily identify themselves as American first and then Mexican. Using 'American-Mexican' is also symbolic because of where they live. Esperanza explains how all her children, even the one born in Mexico feel American.

Since she was a child, she would say that she was not Mexican. She said she was American and there were arguments. "No daughter, you are Mexican," "No, I am American", But I think that they consider themselves American...the three of them, even though she is Mexican, she is Mexican but she thinks she is American.

The feelings that U.S.-born children have about being American and maintaining that identity are common among those interviewed. Thirty-six year old Nancy's family

struggles being in Mexico. Nancy and her husband made a decision to relocate their family to Mexico after being away for twelve years and missing many family milestones. Due to the fact that the children were having a difficult time acclimating themselves and learning the language, Nancy feels terrible about their return and wants to re-migrate. Nancy explains how 8 year old Victor who was born in Denver feels,

They say they are from over there. For example, the oldest one that is 8 years old, he says he is from over there, that he is not from here.

Clearly the child is resisting his Mexican identity. Victor is claiming U.S. cultural citizenship despite living outside of it. Similar to Mexicans feeling American while living in the U.S., Mexicans who have lived in the U.S. and now live in Mexico can also feel connected to the U.S., a place where they no longer reside.

Various other children respond in the same fashion. Kimberly, gets asked about where she was born. *“Where are you from?” Some say, “Do you live here?” “Were you born in Mexico?” No, I was born in the United States.* Despite her young age of 7 years old, Kimberly knows and understands she was not born in the U.S. Yet, she identifies herself as U.S.-born. This is a recurring theme throughout regardless of the age of the child or how long they spent in the U.S.

Children’s answers on national identity are also shaped by U.S. policies. For example, Miguel travels alone to spend time with his grandmother in Mexico because his mother does not have a visa. During the interview, Miguel spoke in English and clarified that he felt connected to both the U.S. and Mexico but that prefers Mexico because he can be outside. In the U.S. he is not allowed to spend time outdoors because his family must live under the radar of immigration officials. Ironically, Miguel also wants to be a U.S.

soldier. Miguel was unable to explain why he aspired to be a U.S. soldier but contextual factors appear to shape children's sense of belonging. Enlisting may be an expression of patriotism and the child may want to feel like he belongs if he serves his country.

Parent views of their own citizenship/nationality/national identity

Analyzing parental responses, I find that birthplace does not result in automatic national identification with that country. In the case of return migrants, parents see themselves as Mexican nationals but 'feel closeness' to the U.S. Despite being 'deported' or impacted by tightening borders, they remain loyal and emotionally connected to the U.S. These individuals are claiming cultural citizenship of the U.S. (Rosaldo 1994).

Esteban's story epitomizes the idea of remaining loyal to the U.S. no matter how difficult his migration journey was. Esteban first set off to the U.S. at the age of 19. He wound up in Washington where he married a woman with one child and had three other children. As a result of attorney fraud, Esteban was ordered deported. The family decided to return to Mexico and leave no one behind,

[The] bad experiences are also good. I will say so, because [the U.S.] in reality, even though one is illegal they always try to support human rights. They are more humanitarian, one has to acknowledge that. I acknowledge that while one is illegal but I have had good experiences in relation to the raising of my children. I cannot say that it is that bad. There are more advantages than disadvantages.

During Esteban's interview, he shared his story about living in Washington, being picked up by ICE, fighting his family's deportation orders, and eventually making their way back to Mexico. Despite all the pain, headache, and sorrow, Esteban still saw the U.S. in a positive light. During his extended recollection, Esteban stressed how laws are enforced in the U.S. and that it is that enforcement that makes the country so great. This feeling can be considered a sign of commitment because Esteban comes to appreciate and

understand the immigration enforcement. Or it may illuminate a person's ultimate quest to feel included in the host state, a place that became familiar.

I can't stay here for too long. It's like I can't stay, I am accustomed being over there [the U.S.] you see.

The familiarity and being accustomed to the American lifestyle was prevalent among the adults and children. Both parents and children were used to a different lifestyle of traffic, stores, and resources, which was very distant from the slow and rural life of San Pedro.

As mentioned earlier, Juan and his family were forced to return to San Pedro after his wife's immigration case was denied. He has spent more of his life in the U.S. than he has in Mexico and identifies more with the U.S. than his own country of birth. Even though Juan's formative years were in Mexico, he formed his family in the U.S., had his children, and had success in the U.S. These experiences transformed him and set him apart from others in San Pedro. In this sense, Juan rejects his Mexican identity and reclaims the experience of being in *el Norte*, a symbol of being as American as a Mexican national can get. He is rejecting the physical boundaries of the border and expressing his desire to be American (Flores 2003). Juan explains,

I'd like to be American, but I was born here. [I consider myself] a Mexican national.

Although Juan was the most frank about his desire to be from the U.S., others alluded to the same point. They regarded the U.S. as a destination, spoke highly of the Nation State, and expressed their understanding of laws and policies geared towards undocumented immigrants. One reason might be because they were accustomed and had

built lives in the U.S. (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering 2015). Esteban describes his experience,

Well over there, it was a really nice experience that I had. I remember that and I say, “Maybe one day I’ll go again, God willing.” But then I think that with due time and maybe I’ll go. But I want to go with a visa. God willing and maybe I’ll be able to take out a visa over time so I can go over there to the U.S because I liked it. I really liked it over there. It was a great experience.

The stories in this section illustrate the desire of undocumented individuals wanting to attain U.S. citizenship, or want to be recognized as members of society. Borders do not always dictate how connected individuals feel to a particular country. Individuals can feel a sense of belonging even if the larger anti-immigrant legislation makes their lives difficult. This is the fundamental point of cultural citizenship and nationalism (Koch 2015): Undocumented individuals may feel connected, like they belong, and they are members of the U.S. not only while living in the country but as I have demonstrated, when they return to their home countries as well. Cultural citizenship is not bound by physical borders and it extends into contexts of return.

De Aqui y De Alla (From Here and From There)

One individual summarizes how the U.S. and Mexico are intimately connected by focusing on the similarities of identities rather than the differences. Leticia, the grandmother of the child who travels alone explains,

They’ll always be Mexican. I always tell my [grand]kids, “My dear kids of mine, even if you were born in a foreign land, you’re always going to be Mexican.”

So although parents and children emphasize the concept of citizenship and Mexico is their ancestral land from a Mexico standpoint, children are considered Mexican nationals because of their roots. However, national identity is based on feelings,

which can change over time, and be a lived experience. Context shapes how feelings are internalized and expressed, and how individuals exercise citizenship (Bloemraad 2000).

Furthermore, feelings of belonging may be reflective of plural nationality and citizenship postnational character (Bosniak 2002). Assuming a decline in state sovereignty and a rise in transnationalism, individuals may want to possess dual citizenship and remain connected to two places, and dual citizenship provides the avenue to do so. In this sample, very few have dual citizenship but interestingly, they claim themselves as Mexican-American. However, as we have seen, possessing dual citizenship does not guarantee alliance to a country.

Discussion

The findings of this study highlight how mixed-status families in Mexico express their national identity. First, I find that despite their ancestral heritage, they do not feel affective towards Mexico. As children develop their identities in Mexico, the majority of children view themselves as “Americanos” and identify as U.S. nationals. As children of U.S.-bound migrants, they understand that they have birthright citizenship and the legal avenues that their parents do not. Parents remain active participants on behalf of the children’s citizenship within the institutional constraints of both Mexico and the U.S. (Bloemraad 2000).

Second, I find that parents also view children as “American” and point out the role that their child's U.S. birthplace plays. Parents explain their child’s national identity in terms of border enforcement, U.S. citizenship and their migration journey. For example, they are cognizant of how their child’s national identity is a product of the U.S. and the government’s deportation power to pursue, arrest, and expel immigrants (Bosniak

2006). Their child's birthright citizenship guaranteed by the same Nation State who had anti-immigrant legislation that could lead to family separation (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering 2015).

Third, although the parents are no longer in the U.S., they envision themselves as cultural citizens of the U.S., sharing values, visions, and the American Dream. The stories captured illustrate how national identity can be imagined similar to Anderson's imagined communities where individuals believe in a community with common values and ideas (Anderson 1991). Strong feelings of belonging are not limited to the national walls. World-capitalism produces new mutations of 'nationality' and immigrants can have nationalism of long distance, without accountability, or the intention of moving home (Anderson 1992). Despite previous literature suggesting that national identity will not be accessible to Latinos in the U.S. (Devos et al. 2010), as this chapter has shown, national identity transcends limitations on citizenship based on national territory.

I find that there are no differences in how Mexican born parents and U.S.-born children feel while now living out of the U.S. Both groups remain connected to the U.S., even if it imagined. Given these results, I conclude that current post-national frameworks such as cultural citizenship are limited and new perspectives of viewing sense of belonging is necessary (Bloemraad 2000). For one, a cultural citizenship framework was adequate in analyzing how parents remain connected to the U.S. However, the theory does adequately explain the situation of their U.S.-born children. Under this framework, the children are expected to feel connected to their ancestral land (Mexico in this case), but they do not entirely. U.S.-born children identify with American values and geographic location (U.S.).

I also find that narrowing down on one dimension of citizenship is limited because dimensions (Bloemraad 2006) overlap. For example, this chapter focuses on sense of belonging or identity. However, respondents based their belonging/identity answers on whether or not they had legal status, a separate dimension of citizenship. It is useful to classify the various dimensions but in the cases of return migration, the data was more complex and nuanced because of the multiple legal statuses.

Furthermore, children without a foreigner card or legal status in Mexico (Gobernacion 2013) are at risk of being unrecognized by both countries if their U.S. passport expires. It is also anticipated that a lack of status places the entire family at a disadvantage because correcting a legal issue while making Mexican wages can be expensive. Since status is an important element of national identity, further research is needed.

The findings in this study extend and provide citizenship and integration studies a useful glimpse of the challenges that mixed-status families are having upon returning to Mexico. Mexico will likely need to address the latent effects of their own citizens aspiring to be U.S. nationals more so than nationals of Mexico. It will need to recognize these new flows of migrants and assist in their integration as it now appears to be doing with its various social programs (Matt 2013). More integrative policies towards noncitizens (such as U.S.-born children) will be necessary, as mixed-status families consist of members with more than one legal status. Further research is required to understand the intricacies of returnee experiences, but on the surface, this study demonstrates that Mexican nationals feel more affective toward the U.S. and these feelings may hinder their re-incorporation into Mexican society.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

This dissertation centered on the incorporation of twenty-first century, mixed-status families in the contexts of reception (Massey et al. 2014) and return (Medina and Menjívar 2015). The second, third, and fourth chapters of this work illustrated patterns of immigrant incorporation. They focused on immigrant well-being, community reception, and national identity, respectively, adding to these research fields. Together, they also contributed to the broad concepts of assimilation, integration, and incorporation.

Analyzing immigrant incorporation patterns in both the U.S. and Mexico concurrently allows us to understand how contexts and immigrants interact under similar conditions (Suárez-Orozco et al. 2011). In 2010, both Latinos such as Mexican immigrants faced harsh political and economic environments, and their experiences highlighted the challenges that mixed-status families endured when they had multiple legal statuses. This dissertation argues that belonging to a mixed-status family (a bi-product of nation-state policies) shapes integration experiences which take place within a nested system (Bronfenbrenner and Morris 2006). This nested system consists of immediate environments (microsystems), mesosystems (interrelations) exosystems (community level) and macrosystems (societal, policy and cultural belief systems) (Bronfenbrenner and Morris 2006). In Chapter 2, we heard directly from Latino immigrants as they described their search for work, the economy, and the ways they dealt with anti-immigrant legislation, such as SB1070. The life satisfaction stories varied by how integrated into their context of reception they were. In Chapter 3, I discussed how Latino families expressed how they did not feel well received by family members and

local community members after relocating to Mexico—sometimes involuntarily. In Chapter 4, I discussed how the same families described how they sometimes feel close ties to the U.S. This juxtaposition indicates that mixed-status families are not incorporated well into Mexican society. At the same time, these stories provided a glimpse of reciprocal processes which may play a part in how the contexts responded to this situation, and which future research should focus on.

In the second chapter, I utilized U.S.-based mixed-method data from 2009–2013 to examine what indicators shape life satisfaction for immigrants living in Phoenix, Arizona. The results of this work suggest that immigrant life satisfaction varies by integration level. Those who were less integrated spoke of their migration decisions, but also of their need to maintain and secure employment. The more integrated immigrants responded with stories of how they navigated the various levels of bureaucracy, dealt with English fluency, and discussed their desire to learn more skills. Here, two themes emerged across the results. The first was regret for not learning the English language earlier. The second was their inability to attend formal schooling in the U.S. Both the importance of education and English proficiency is consistent with previous findings on these subjects (Dowling et al. 2012).

Using an ecological theory was meaningful in evaluating how numerous indicators, such as individual, household, community, and policy-level factors, can shape the life satisfaction of immigrants. The themes derived from the data directly support the idea of taking the exosystem and microsystem nested system into account when discussing migrants and immigrants in their cultural contexts. Some factors that are positively associated with integration include young age of arrival (Rumbaut 2004),

access to and the mobilization of resources, fluency in host country language (Zhou, 1997), and higher levels of education (Hammer et al. 2007, 2008; Pérez et al. 2007), while factors that are constructed as negative include alienation (Eastwood et al. 2013), low socioeconomic status (Williams et al. 2010), belonging to a mixed-status household (Fix and Zimmermann 1999), negative society reception (Portes and Zhou 1993), and lack of presence of social networks (Massey et al., 1987, p. 140). When these factors were analyzed with life satisfaction responses, themes regarding socioeconomic status, maintaining employment, education and English fluency emerged.

My findings in this chapter provide new data on immigrant life satisfaction within hostile contexts. Many shared stories of how they, as immigrants, made sense of their life histories and migration journeys, and carried out important life decisions in places like Arizona, where legal and social landscapes may not be very welcoming. It is also valuable to use life satisfaction as an indicator of immigrant integration, as the migrants volunteered their personal migration histories as evidence of their levels of contentment. Their experiences, including opportunities and barriers to integration, are linked to individual perceptions about how satisfied they are with their life situations. For example, one of the common themes among those interviewed revolved around being unable to attend school and not learning English earlier. Immigrant dissatisfaction cannot be interpreted as an individual decision or responsibility but should be interpreted as a reflection of the environment in which the person is living through. Thus, integration is an interactive process between the individual and its context.

In the third chapter, I utilized Mexico-based qualitative data from 2010 to analyze how mixed-status families have been incorporated in Mexico on a community level, or

exosystem (Bronfenbrenner and Morris 2006). Through an inductive analysis, I evaluated how Mexican national parents and their U.S.-born children perceive the Mexican contexts that have received them. Here, I found that many parents and children returnees feel they are treated differently in Mexican societies. They have varied perceptions as to how they feel local community members and extended families receive them. I found that children feel welcomed on a familial level, which is comprised of extended family, but not at the community level, which is made up of neighbors and schools. This is consistent with other studies, for example, where a local community did not receive second-generation Japanese-Brazilians well in their ancestral lands (Takeyuki Tsuda 2003). On the other hand, parents feel better received than their children at the community level. This may be due to the intensity of friendships.

However, the findings also suggest that parents are not well received by their immediate and extended family members, which was attributed to their experiences of living abroad. The experience of immigrating to the U.S. and then returning placed returnees in an awkward position when they returned to Mexico. Although returnees attempted to pick up where they left off in their lives with family “back home,” they felt that they were too changed; they had experienced new contexts firsthand, dealt with new challenges in the U.S.—sometimes with success and sometimes with failure—and had been exposed to new ideas. Thus, some returned to Mexico with social capital, but also with nostalgia when they reflected on memories of living in the U.S. Many relationships changed while living outside of their native country. Occasionally, family ties were strained and pushed to their limits, leading to a build-up of resentment that intensified the return migration experience. Outside of their family environments, most parents felt

better received by the larger community. Perhaps this was because they were elated to see their friends and to rekindle old friendships or, perhaps, because there was less social interaction and less at stake with friends than with family.

In the cases of U.S.-born children relocating to Mexico with their parents, they felt better received by extended family than by the larger community. One explanation for this might be that the extended families buffer integration shock. To the children, the larger community was not as receptive, and this parallels the sometimes hostile, anti-immigration communities in the United States that their parents experienced.

In the fourth chapter, I continued my analysis of immigration integration by exploring the national identity of mixed-status families in Mexico by analyzing their use of citizenship and nationality concepts. Although they used concepts synonymously, I found that there were certain differences between the two groups. Parents and U.S.-born children firmly attested that U.S.-born children are “Mexican American” or “American.” The parents and children seemed to use the terms of citizenship and nationality synonymously to describe feelings of loyalty and affection. Furthermore, here, the parents felt “American” also, and they strongly connected to the U.S., despite their legal Mexican nationality.

A cultural citizenship framework (Rosaldo 1994, 1997) assists in explaining why Mexican nationals feel connected to the U.S. instead of their own native country. Mexican nationals can still feel loyal to the U.S. despite physical distance, deportation, immigration histories, and legal challenges. This loyalty connects them to the U.S., allowing them to claim this cultural citizenship, even after negative experiences. However, the cultural citizenship framework does not seem to explain why U.S.-born

children living in Mexico do not feel affective toward Mexico or desire to be a part of the local community. When a cultural citizenship theory is applied to the cases of return migration, I find that this framework does not help explain the national identity of mixed-status families because of the complexity of the situation. Existing frameworks are limited in capturing multiple contexts, statuses, and other nuances that are lived. Migration conditions affect entire families not just single members, so parents who would normally be expected to feel connected to Mexico are not because their children may not feel a sense of belonging.

Strengths and Weaknesses

One of the major strengths of the second chapter (U.S.-based life satisfaction analysis) is in the research design. Using a mixed-methods approach in this study worked well because surveys provided data that otherwise would not have been unavailable such as data on resources, alienation, schooling, socioeconomic status, and societal reception. Life-satisfaction data was only captured in qualitative interviews so marrying the two methods was valuable. Second, the data captured during this period was ideal for following the dynamics between contextual factors such as SB1070 and undocumented immigrants. Due to the heightened political climate, the data collection itself was a challenge but was buffered by sending out bilingual and bicultural interviewers to collect data on the households. The interviewers were able to tap into information that may not have been possible with a non-Latino interview team. A fourth strength is the unique attempt to quantify immigrant integration while considering multiple dynamics and interactions between individual, household, and community spheres.

There are certain limitations of the second chapter which should be taken into account such as the limited responses (N=54) and the type of analysis. To some, the sample may be small for a quantitative analysis but for a mixed-methods study, the sample size was adequate and data saturation was reached. Themes in life satisfaction responses may have increased, but the themes made available through this number already provide a new view and add to the literature on life satisfaction of immigrants living in hostile contexts. Furthermore, a multivariate regression analysis might have been more appropriate to answer questions about life satisfaction predictors. The integration index would then have been included as one of these predictors.

One of the major strengths of the third and fourth chapters is the analytical lenses used to understand mixed-status families. By applying a U.S.-bound *modes of incorporation* and *cultural citizenship* framework to return migration, I was able to extend the field's understanding of how mixed-status families re(integrate) into Mexico society and carry their visions and feelings of U.S. citizenship with them wherever they may go. It was necessary to tailor the frameworks but the major discovery highlights how these two theories are limited and do not assist in explaining the new migration patterns evolving as a consequence of U.S. anti-immigration policies. A second strength of these two chapters is the timeliness of the interviews. When the data collecting began in 2010, little was known about the make-up of those returning to Mexico and even less about whether or not they were mixed-status families. New 2015 INEGI findings have finally begun to corroborate the information collected in 2010, making this data timely and powerful.

Although the sample size was small (N=23), in chapters three and four, I was able to encapsulate the various reasons for return migration. That said, one limitation of these chapters is that the answers are unbalanced by gender (17 females; 6 males). As most of the participants were women, I was unable to capture more variation in the male responses but this does not hinder the findings. A second limitation of the third and fourth chapters was the sampling frame. The study aimed at understanding mixed-status households and their experiences as they returned to Mexico, specifically those that returned together as a family unit but this severely limited the reality of what mixed-status families are experiencing. As I collected data, I was unable to interview persons with such a narrowed sampling frame. Anecdotally, I found that more often than not, individuals from mixed-status families were living in Mexico due to deportation while their partners and children remained in the U.S. These family members are often times in limbo while they figure out the logistics of how they plan on reunifying their family. Being unable to capture the stories of these individuals was a drawback for this particular study, but future work should redirect efforts to include individuals that are neglected from family research but still belong to a family. Furthermore, it is important to point out that the findings do not imply that all immigrants will have these exact experiences when returning to their homelands or when living in hostile contexts. Nonetheless it provides an idea of the challenges being experienced.

That said, this dissertation as a whole does provide a unique view of immigrant experiences across two countries, offers examples of what mixed-status families must endure, and how immigrants make sense of their host and receiving societies. Although the sample sizes are small, I believe that many of the experiences are universal in the

sense that the majority of families become mixed-status as a result of flattening worlds, migration, and intermarriage.

Future Work

Future studies on immigrant integration should attempt to collect longitudinal data with the same individuals (from mixed-status families) across two countries to observe changes over time. This would offer researchers a baseline for integration comparisons, and allow for a very seldom view of how immigrant integration develops and fluctuates over time. These studies should also account for the fluidity of immigrant incorporation, particularly the nuances associated with perceptions, feelings, and attitudes. While surveys may assist in garnering a larger sample, future research must still allow for grounded theory research rather than solely relying on quantitative findings. At the same time, researchers must interpret their findings by including macro level noise for a more comprehensive view of incorporation since immigrant integration does not take place in a vacuum. These suggestions stem from the findings in this dissertation. For example, my work highlights the fact that dichotomized findings (such as life satisfaction, reception, and citizenship/nationality) are troublesome because immigrant lives are very complex. Though their experiences may involve painful memories, those events may also provide them with irreplaceable opportunities such as being able to raise their children in the U.S. and give them an education, so immigrant responses to particular questions will not be binary.

Overall, these chapters on life satisfaction, community reception, and national identity complement each other and provide an overall view of immigration incorporation. Individual chapters make contributions to the fields of immigrant well-

being, community reception, and national identity. Each chapter is meaningful because it presents cases of how immigrants are faring today. For example, the second chapter attempts to measure integration as a whole to see what predictors shape life satisfaction on an individual level, or microsystem (Bronfenbrenner and Morris 2006). The third chapter examines integration at the community level or exosystem, dissecting how two groups internalize their feeling regarding how they are being received. The fourth chapter examines how individuals describe their national identity, which is also an indicator of how immigrants are integrating.

As a whole, this dissertation is significant because each section focuses on the mixed-status of Latino families and their descendants across two contexts, which, demographically, will continue to grow both in the U.S. and in Mexico (INEGI n.d.). Although the U.S. based sample (chapter two) consists of non-Mexican Latinos too, the sample is mostly Mexican so the findings are consistent with current Latino demographics in the U.S. The findings concerning the Mexico-based sample (chapter three and four) may also be applicable to other Latinos facing similar deportations such as Central Americans. However, it is expected that Central American return migration is even more complex, given the large number of child migrants currently being detained and amount of immigrants being sent home. Furthermore, the findings also contribute to research work being conducted in Arizona on immigrant families (Quiroga et al. 2014; Santos and Menjivar 2014) and Mexico on returnees (Gonzalez and Zúñiga 2014; Moran-Taylor and Menjivar 2005; Valdez-Gardea 2012; Zúñiga and Hamann 2009). The findings in the second chapter lend information on the immigrants living in one of the most hostile states in the U.S. and is in ground zero of immigration disputes. The findings

in the third and fourth chapters extend knowledge on migrant families, deportees, and mixed-status individuals who must re-make their lives outside the country they call home. Lastly, the dissertation provides examples of how immigrants incorporate at both the individual and community level while, simultaneously, while considering government policies, political noise, and larger-picture, geopolitical situations.

Policy Recommendations

Several recommendations may be beneficial to governments responding to immigrant newcomers and returnees such as the U.S. and Mexico. The U.S. can benefit from a government run integration program that will assist immigrants find employment, learn English, enroll children in schools, and be partnered with additional resources. Churches have primarily been the leaders in taking on these initiatives, but these funds can be limited. Government run programs and initiatives such as the Citizenship and Integration Grant Program by the Department of Homeland Security are also helpful but must be geared at incorporating immigrants at more than civic integration level. Immigrants may need to satisfy their basic needs first before pursuing naturalization and citizenship. A better model for a true integration program is that of the Office of Refugee Resettlement Program where new populations including refugees, asylees, Cuban/Haitian entrants, Special Immigrant Visa (SIV) holders, Amerasians, and victims of human trafficking who are partnered with private and government programs which then provide job training and business opportunities, cultural adjustment, home purchasing assistance, and various other types of assistance. This second model is preferred because it is geared at assisting immigrants with not only basic needs such as monetary services, but at helping newcomers with other services that will help them become acquainted with U.S.

types of bank accounts, navigate bureaucracies, and become self-sufficient and eventually become voting participants. The last key recommendation is that these programs should be inclusive of all immigrants, regardless of legal entry or not.

In Mexico, re-integration programs may be also valuable and successful. New re-integration programs have become available since 2010 such as the Paisano program that is geared toward return migrants. Since no data is presently available on how these programs function or are carried out, it is recommended that these government programs be further researched and analyzed for effectiveness. Grass root organizations may be more successful at reaching returnees but funds may be limited to fully execute the project scopes. It is suggested that local government reach out to existing grass root organizations and fund those programs rather than create new federal programs that may not meet the needs of returnees and their families. Another recommendation is for Mexico to produce a central point of resources available to returnees and their families. It is also essential that laws and policies be standardized across all states so that returnees do not have to visit multiple offices to obtain one service. Lastly, mixed-status families may also benefit from social support group at local migrant centers where they may be able to meet others who are in similar positions, economically, legally, and socially.

REFERENCES

- Abrego, Leisy J. 2011. "Legal Consciousness of Undocumented Latinos: Fear and Stigma as Barriers to Claims-Making for First- and 1.5-Generation Immigrants." *Law & Society Review* 45(2):337–70. Retrieved (<http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1540-5893.2011.00435.x>).
- ACLU. 2016. "Arizona's SB1070." Retrieved January 1, 2016 (<https://www.aclu.org/feature/arizonas-sb-1070>).
- Agozino, Biko, ed. 2000. *Theoretical and Methodological Issues in Migration Research*. Vermont: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Alba, Richard, and Victor Nee. 1997. "Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration." *International migration review* 31(4):826–74. Retrieved April 12, 2014 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2547416>).
- Alba, Richard, and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Harvard University Press.
- Allanhar, Anton. 2006. "Always on the Move." P. 263 in *Returning to the Source: The Final Stage of the Caribbean Migration Circuit*, edited by Dwaine Plaza. Kingston: University of the West Indies Press.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1992. "Long-Distance Nationalism: World Capitalism and the Rise of Identity Politics." *The Wertheim Lecture, 1992* 1–11.
- Anderson, Jill. 2013. *In (Re)Productive Age: Return Migration, CallCenters, and the (Re)Production of Culture*. Mexico City.
- Anderson, Jill, and Nin Solis. 2014. *Los Otros Dreamers*. Mexico City: Impresion Printing.
- Anon. 2000. *Arizona Proposition 203*. Retrieved (<http://www.azsos.gov/election/2000/info/pubpamphlet/english/prop203.htm>).
- Anon. 2016a. "Office of Refugee Resettlement." Retrieved (<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/orr/programs/ida/about>).
- Anon. 2016b. "U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services." Retrieved (<https://www.uscis.gov/about-us/citizenship-and-integration-grant-program>).

- Arce, JM, RS Alfaro, and JAS Mora. 2012. "Internacional de Retorno En El Estado de México: Oportunidades Y Retos Para El Aprovechamiento Para El Aprovechamiento Socioprodutivo de Sus Capacidades." *Suma de ...* 2:45–62. Retrieved December 13, 2012 (<http://openjournal.konradlorenz.edu.co/index.php/SumaDeNegocios/article/viewFile/875/606>).
- Arce, Montoya, Salas Alfaro, Soberón Mora, and José Antonio. 2011. "La Migracion de Retorno Desde Estados Unidos Hacia El Estado De Mexico: Oportunidades Y Retos." *Cuadernos Geograficos* 5462:153–78.
- Arp-Nissen, J. Durand. 2004. "Ensayo Teórico Sobre La Emigración de Retorno: El Principio Del Rendimiento Decreciente." *Cuadernos geográficos de la Universidad ...* 35:103–16. Retrieved December 14, 2012 (<http://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=1202751>).
- Balassiano, K., and M. Maldonado. 2013. "Civic Spaces in Rural New Gateway Communities." *Community Development Journal*. Retrieved March 20, 2014 (<http://cdj.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/doi/10.1093/cdj/bst029>).
- Barger, Steven D., Carrie J. Donoho, and Heidi A. Wayment. 2014. "The Relative Contributions of Race / Ethnicity , Socioeconomic Status , and Social Relationships to Life Satisfaction in the United Health , States." 18(2):179–89.
- Bazán-Ramirez, Aldo, and Gabriela Galván-Zariñana. 2013. "Incorporation of Migrant Students Returning From the United States to High Schools in Mexico." *International Migration* 53(1).
- Bean, F. D., M. Leach, and BL Lowell. 2004. "Immigrant Job Quality and Mobility in the United States." *Work and Occupations* 31(4):499–518. Retrieved April 12, 2014 (<http://wox.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/0730888404268902>).
- Bean, Frank D., Susa K. Brown, Mark A. Leach, James D. Bachmeier, and Jennifer Van Hook. 2013. "Unauthorized Mexican Migration and the Socioeconomic Integration of Mexican Americans."
- Bean, Frank D., Mark A. Leach, Susan K. Brown, James D. Bachmeier, and John R. Hipp. 2011. "The Educational Legacy of Unauthorized Migration: Comparisons Across U.S.-Immigrant Groups in How Parents' Status Affects Their Offspring1." *International Migration Review* 45(2):348–85. Retrieved April 12, 2014 (<http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2011.00851.x>).
- Beauchemin, Cris, and Amparo González-Ferrier. 2011. "Sampling International Migrants with Origin-Based Snowballing Method." *Demographic Research* 25:103–34. Retrieved October 26, 2012 (<http://www.demographic-research.org/volumes/vol25/3/>).

- Berry, John W. 1997. "Immigration, Acculturation, and Adaptation." *Applied Psychology* 46(1):5–34. Retrieved (<http://www.catchword.com/cgi-bin/cgi?body=linker&ini=xref&reqdoi=10.1080/026999497378467>).
- Black, Richard, and Russell King. 2004. "Editorial Introduction: Migration, Return and Development in West Africa." *Population, Space and Place* 10(2):75–83. Retrieved March 22, 2014 (<http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/psp.318>).
- Bloemraad, Irene. 2000. "Citizenship and Immigration a Current Review." *Journal of International Migration and Integration / Revue de l'integration et de la migration internationale* 1(1):9–37.
- Bloemraad, Irene. 2006. "Becoming a Citizen in the United States and Canada: Structured Mobilization and Immigrant Political Incorporation." *Social Forces* 85(2):667–96 (30). Retrieved (http://muse.jhu.edu/content/crossref/journals/social_forces/v085/85.2bloemraad.html).
- Bosniak, Linda. 2002. "Multiple Nationality and the Postnational Transformation of Citizenship." *Virginia Journal of International Law* 42:979–1004.
- Bosniak, Linda. 2006. *The Citizen and the Alien*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Brabeck, K. M., and Q. Xu. 2010. "The Impact of Detention and Deportation on Latino Immigrant Children and Families: A Quantitative Exploration." *Hispanic Journal Of Behavioral Sciences* 32(3):341–61. Retrieved February 11, 2013 (<http://hjb.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/0739986310374053>).
- Bronfenbrenner, Urie, and Pamela a. Morris. 2006. "The Bioecological Model of Human Development." *Handbook of Child Psychology, Theoretical Models of Human Development* 793–828. Retrieved (<http://psycnet.apa.org/psycinfo/2006-08774-014>).
- Brown, SK, and FD Bean. 2006. "Assimilation Models, Old and New: Explaining a Long-Term Process." *Migration information source* 1–9. Retrieved April 12, 2014 (<http://www.migrationinformation.com/USfocus/print.cfm?ID=442>).
- Bumgarner, Erin, and Meiko Lin. 2013. "Hispanic Immigrant Children's English Language Acquisition: The Role of Socioeconomic Status and Early Care Arrangement." *Early Education & Development* (March 2014):1–15. Retrieved March 20, 2014 (<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10409289.2013.822230>).
- Carey, Sean. 2002. "Undivided Loyalties: Is National Identity an Obstacle to European Integration?" *European Union Politics* 3(200212):387–413.

- Cassarino, Jean-Pierre. 2004. "Theorising Return Migration: The Conceptual Approach to Return Migrants Revisited." *International Journal of Multicultural Societies* 6(2):253–79.
- Census, U. S. 2013. "U.S. Census." Retrieved March 6, 2015 (<http://www.census.gov/>).
- Center, Immigrant Policy. 2013. "Arizona: Immigrant Entrepreneurs, Innovation, and Welcoming Initiatives in the Grand Canyon State." Retrieved (<http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/just-facts/arizona-immigrant-entrepreneurs-innovation-and-welcoming-initiatives-grand-canyon-state>).
- Chavez, Leo. 1994. "The Power of Imagined Community: The Settlement of Undocumented Mexicans and Central Americans in the United States." *American Anthropologist* 96:52–73.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 2001. "Like One of the Family: Race, Ethnicity, and the Paradox of US National Identity." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24(1):3–28.
- Constitution, Arizona. 2006. *Article 28 §3 (B)*. Retrieved (<http://www.azleg.gov/Constitution.asp?Article=28>).
- Conway, Dennis. 2005. *The Experience of Return Migration*. edited by Joan Phillips Robert Potter, Dennis Conway. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Cook-Martin, David. 2013. *The Scramble for Citizens: Dual Nationality and State Competition for Immigrants*. Stanford University Press.
- Crosnoe, Robert. 2014. "Double Disadvantage or Signs of Resilience ? The Elementary School Contexts of Children From Mexican Immigrant Families." *American Educational Research Journal* 42(2):269–303.
- Cuellar, Israel, Elena Bastida, and Sara Maria Braccio. 2004. "Residency in the United States, Subjective Well-Being, and Depression in an Older Mexican-Origin Sample." *Journal of aging and health* 16(4):447–66. Retrieved October 16, 2014 (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15271265>).
- Desmond, Mathew, and Mustafa Emirbayer. 2010. *Racial Domination, Racial Progress*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Devos, Thierry, Kelly Gavin, and Francisco J. Quintana. 2010. "Say 'adios' to the American Dream? The Interplay between Ethnic and National Identity among Latino and Caucasian Americans." *Cultural diversity & ethnic minority psychology* 16(1):37–49.
- DeWind, Josh, and Philip Kasinitz. 1997. "Everything Old Is New Again? Processes and Theories of Immigrant Incorporation." *International Migration Review* 31(4):1096–1111. Retrieved April 12, 2014 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2547425>).

- Diaz-McConnell, Eileen, and Ilana Redstone Akresh. 2008. "Through the Front Door: The Housing New Lawful Immigrants." *International Migration Review* 42(1):134–62. Retrieved (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27645718>).
- Djajić, Slobodan. 2008. "Immigrant Parents and Children: An Analysis of Decisions Related to Return Migration." *Review of Development Economics* 12(3):469–85. Retrieved October 25, 2012 (<http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1467-9361.2008.00441.x>).
- Domínguez, Silvia, and Celeste Watkins. 2003. "Creating Networks for Survival and Mobility: Social Capital Among African- American and Latin-American Low-Income Mothers." *Social Problems* 50(1):111–35.
- Donato, Katharine M., and Amada Armenta. 2011. "What We Know About Unauthorized Migration." *Annual Review of Sociology* 37(1):529–43. Retrieved December 17, 2012 (<http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev-soc-081309-150216>).
- Dowling, Julie a., Christopher G. Ellison, and David L. Leal. 2012. "Who Doesn't Value English? Debunking Myths About Mexican Immigrants' Attitudes Toward the English Language*." *Social Science Quarterly* 93(2):n/a – n/a. Retrieved December 16, 2014 (<http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1540-6237.2012.00850.x>).
- Dreby, Joanna. 2010. *Divided by Borders: Mexican Migrants and Their Children*. University of California Press.
- Dreby, Joanna. 2012. "The Burden of Deportation on Children in Mexican Immigrant Families." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 2011(August):829–45. Retrieved April 14, 2013 (<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.00989.x/full>).
- Durand, Jorge. 2010. "Los Inmigrantes También Emigran: La Migración de Retorno Como Corolario Del Proceso." *Revista Interdisciplinar da Mobilidade Humana* 167–90. Retrieved September 15, 2013 (<http://www.csem.org.br/remhu/index.php/remhu/article/viewArticle/40>).
- Ea, EE. 2008. "Facilitating Acculturation of Foreign-Educated Nurses." *Online Journal of Issues in Nursing* 1–13. Retrieved October 25, 2014 (<http://198.65.98.170/MainMenuCategories/ANAMarketplace/ANAPeriodicals/OJIN/TableofContents/vol132008/No1Jan08/ArticlePreviousTopic/ForeignEducatedNurses.aspx>).
- Eastwood, John et al. 2013. "Social Exclusion, Infant Behavior, Social Isolation, and Maternal Expectations Independently Predict Maternal Depressive Symptoms." *Brain and behavior* 3(1):14–23. Retrieved November 22, 2014 (<http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3568785&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract>).

- Elgar, Frank J. et al. 2011. "Social Capital, Health and Life Satisfaction in 50 Countries." *Health & place* 17(5):1044–53. Retrieved October 23, 2014 (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21784694>).
- Enforcement, U. S. Immigration and Customs. 2014. *Deportation of Aliens Claiming U.S.-Born Children: Second Half, Calendar Year 2013 Report to Congress*. Retrieved (<http://big.assets.huffingtonpost.com/2013report2.pdf>).
- Felix, Adrian. 2013. "Dreams of Citizenship, Naturalization Nightmare: New Naturalization Norms Needed." *Center for Latino Policy Research*. Retrieved March 20, 2014 (<http://escholarship.org/uc/item/62p083rr.pdf>).
- Fix, Michael, and Wendy Zimmermann. 1999. "All under One Roof: Mixed-Status Families in an Era of Reform." *International Migration Review* 35(2):397–419. Retrieved April 12, 2014 (<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2001.tb00023.x/abstract>).
- Flores, R. D. 2014. "Living in the Eye of the Storm: How Did Hazleton's Restrictive Immigration Ordinance Affect Local Interethnic Relations?" *American Behavioral Scientist* 0002764214537266 – . Retrieved (<http://abs.sagepub.com/content/early/2014/06/05/0002764214537266.abstract>).
- Flores, R., and E. Telles. 2012. "Social Stratification in Mexico: Disentangling Color, Ethnicity, and Class." *American Sociological Review* 77(3):486–94. Retrieved April 22, 2013 (<http://asr.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/0003122412444720>).
- Flores, W. V. 2003. "New Citizens, New Rights: Undocumented Immigrants and Latino Cultural Citizenship." *Latin American Perspectives* 30(2):87–100. Retrieved (<http://www.scopus.com/inward/record.url?eid=2-s2.0-0037348412&partnerID=40&md5=60aa245919d692b8215a49a2f1ec4c29>).
- Foner, Nancy, and Joanna Dreby. 2011. "Relations Between the Generations in Immigrant Families." *Annual Review of Sociology* 37(1):545–64. Retrieved August 15, 2013 (<http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev-soc-081309-150030>).
- Fullilove, M. T. 1996. "Psychiatric Implications of Displacement: Contributions from the Psychology of Place." *The American journal of psychiatry* 153(12):1516–23. Retrieved (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8942445>).
- Gallo, Linda C. et al. 2013. "Socioeconomic Status and Stress in Mexican-American Women: A Multi-Method Perspective." *Journal of behavioral medicine* 36(4):379–88. Retrieved December 16, 2014 (<http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3929319&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract>).

- Gans, HJ. 1992. "Comment: Ethnic Invention and Acculturation, a Bumpy-Line Approach." *Journal of American Ethnic History* 12(1):42–52. Retrieved December 16, 2014 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27501012>).
- Gans, HJ. 1997. "Toward a Reconciliation Of 'assimilation' and 'pluralism': The Interplay of Acculturation and Ethnic Retention." *International migration review* 31(4):875–92. Retrieved April 12, 2014 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2547417>).
- Garcia Zamora, Rodolfo, and Rosa Elena. 2014. "Hallazgos Preliminares Sobre Migración de Retorno En Seis Estados." in *Los impactos y desafíos del retorno de los migrantes mexicanos de Estados Unidos: Hacia un Programa de Apoyo Integral de los Migrantes y sus Familias*. Retrieved (<http://www.colef.mx/sepmig/?p=3743>).
- Glick, Jennifer E., Laquitta Walker, and Luciana Luz. 2013. "Linguistic Isolation in the Home and Community: Protection or Risk for Young Children?" *Social science research* 42(1):140–54. Retrieved February 24, 2014 (<http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3499731&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract>).
- Gmelch, George. 1980. "Return Migration." *Annual review of anthropology* 9:135–59. Retrieved June 19, 2014 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2155732>).
- Gobernacion, Secretaria de. 1974. *Ley General de Poblacion*. Retrieved (http://www.diputados.gob.mx/LeyesBiblio/ref/lgp/LGP_orig_07ene74_ima.pdf).
- Gonzalez, Betsabe Roman, and Victor Zúñiga. 2014. "Children Returning from the U.S. to Mexico: School Sweet School." *Migraciones Internacionales* 7(July-Dec):277–86.
- Gonzalez-Murphy, LV, and Rey Koslowski. 2011. "Understanding Mexico's Changing Immigration Laws." (March). Retrieved August 6, 2013 ([http://www.theislamistsarecoming.com/sites/default/files/GONZALEZ %2026 KOSLOWSKI.pdf](http://www.theislamistsarecoming.com/sites/default/files/GONZALEZ%20KOSLOWSKI.pdf)).
- Good, Mary Ellen, Sophia Masewicz, and Linda Vogel. 2010. "Latino English Language Learners: Bridging Achievement and Cultural Gaps Between Schools and Families." *Journal of Latinos and Education* 9(4):321–39. Retrieved December 16, 2014 (<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15348431.2010.491048>).
- Guarnizo, Luis Eduardo. 1996. "Going Home: Class, Gender and Household Transformation among Dominican Return Migrants." Pp. 13–60 in *Caribbean Circuits: New Directions in the Study of Caribbean Migration*. Center for Migration Studies.

- Hagan, Jacqueline, Brianna Castro, and Nestor Rodriguez. 2009. *Effects of U.S. Deportation Policies on Immigrant Families and Communities: Cross-Border Perspectives, The*. Retrieved February 11, 2013 (<http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/nclr88&id=1813&div=&collection=journals>).
- Hall, CE. 2010. "Where Are My Children-And My Rights-Parental Rights Termination as a Consequence of Deportation." *Duke LJ*. Retrieved December 11, 2014 (http://heinonlinebackup.com/hol-cgi-bin/get_pdf.cgi?handle=hein.journals/duklr60§ion=41).
- Haller, William, and Scott M. Lynch. 2011. "Dreams Fulfilled and Shattered: Determinants of Segmented Assimilation in the Second Generation." *Social Forces* 89(3):1–32.
- Hammer, Carol Scheffner, Frank R. Lawrence, and Adele W. Miccio. 2007. "Bilingual Children's Language Abilities and Early Reading Outcomes in Head Start and Kindergarten." *Language speech and hearing services in schools* 38(3):237–48. Retrieved ([http://lshss.asha.org/cgi/doi/10.1044/0161-1461\(2007/025\)](http://lshss.asha.org/cgi/doi/10.1044/0161-1461(2007/025))).
- Hammer, Carol Scheffner, Frank R. Lawrence, and Adele W. Miccio. 2008. "Exposure to English before and after Entry into Head Start: Bilingual Children's Receptive Language Growth in Spanish and English." *International Journal Of Bilingual Education And Bilingualism* 11(1):30–56. Retrieved (<http://www.informaworld.com/openurl?genre=article&doi=10.2167/beb376.0&magic=crossref>).
- Henry, Dwaine E. Plaza and Frances. 2006. "An Overview of Return Migration to the English-Speaking Caribbean." Pp. 1–29 in *Returning to the Source*, edited by Dwaine Henry, E. Plaza, and Frances. Jamaica: University of the West Indies Press.
- Hurtado-de-Mendoza, Alejandra, Felisa a Gonzales, Adriana Serrano, and Stacey Kaltman. 2014. "Social Isolation and Perceived Barriers to Establishing Social Networks among Latina Immigrants." *American journal of community psychology* 53(1-2):73–82. Retrieved December 20, 2014 (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24402726>).
- INEGI. 2010. "Poblacion, Nacional de Estadistica Y Geografia." Retrieved December 14, 2012 (<http://www.inegi.org.mx/Sistemas/temasV2/Default.aspx?s=est&c=17484>).
- INEGI. n.d. "Los Extranjeros En Mexico." Retrieved April 30, 2015 (http://www.inegi.gob.mx/prod_serv/contenidos/espanol/bvinegi/productos/estudios/sociodemografico/ext_en_mex/extraen_mex.pdf).
- Jie Zong, and Jeanne Batalova. 2014. "Mexican Immigrants in the United States." *Migration Policy Institute*. Retrieved January 3, 2016 (<http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/mexican-immigrants-united-states>).

- Jiménez, TR. 2011. "Immigrants in the United States: How Well Are They Integrating Into Society?" *Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute*. Retrieved April 12, 2014 (<http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&btnG=Search&q=intitle:Immigrants+in+the+United+States:+How+Well+Are+They+Integrating+into+Society?#0>).
- Kim, Giyeon, Claudia X. Aguado Loi, et al. 2011. "Limited English Proficiency as a Barrier to Mental Health Service Use: A Study of Latino and Asian Immigrants with Psychiatric Disorders." *Journal of psychiatric research* 45(1):104–10. Retrieved December 16, 2014 (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20537658>).
- Kim, Giyeon, Courtney B. Worley, et al. 2011. "Vulnerability of Older Latino and Asian Immigrants with Limited English Proficiency." *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 59(7):1246–52. Retrieved December 16, 2014 (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21718269>).
- King, Russell. 1978. "Return Migration: A Neglected Aspect of Population Geography." *Area* 10(3):175–82. Retrieved August 3, 2014 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/20001343>).
- Koch, Natalie. 2015. "Is Nationalism Just for Nationals? Civic Nationalism for Noncitizens and Celebrating National Day in Qatar and the UAE." *Political Geography*.
- Krogstad, Jens Manuel. 2016. *5 Facts about Mexico and Immigration to the U.S.* Retrieved February 23, 2016 (<http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/02/11/mexico-and-immigration-to-us/>).
- Laglagaron, L. 2010. *Protection through Integration: The Mexican Government's Efforts to Aid Migrants in the United States*. Retrieved December 13, 2012 (<http://migrationpolicy.org/pubs/IME-Jan2010.pdf>).
- Landale, N. S., J. H. Hardie, R. S. Oropesa, and M. M. Hillemeier. 2015. "Behavioral Functioning among Mexican-Origin Children: Does Parental Legal Status Matter?" *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 56(1):2–18. Retrieved (<http://hsb.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/0022146514567896>).
- Lara-Cinisomo, Sandraluz, Yange Xue, and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn. 2013. "Latino Youth's Internalising Behaviours: Links to Immigrant Status and Neighbourhood Characteristics." *Ethnicity & health* 18(3):315–35. Retrieved (<http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=4212314&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract>).
- Leary, Anna Ochoa O., and Azucena Sanchez. 2008. "Mixed-Immigration-Status Households in the Context of Arizona's Anti-Immigrant Policies: Implications for Health Disparities."

- Lindstrom, D. P. 1996. "Economic Opportunity in Mexico and Return Migration from the United States." *Demography* 33(3):357–74. Retrieved (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8875068>).
- Lorenzo- Hernández, José. 1999. "The Nuyoricán's Dilemma: Categorization of Returning Migrants in Puerto Rico." *International Migration Review* 33(4):988–1013.
- Marquardt, Marie, Timothy Steigenga, Philip Williams, and Manuel Vasquez. 2013. *Living "illegal": The Human Face of Unauthorized Immigration*. The New Press.
- Marrow, HB. 2009. "Immigrant Bureaucratic Incorporation: The Dual Roles of Professional Missions and Government Policies." *American Sociological Review* 74(5):756–76. Retrieved April 12, 2014 (<http://asr.sagepub.com/content/74/5/756.short>).
- Marsiglia, Flavio F., Stephen Kulis, Hilda Garcia Perez, and Monica Bermudez-Parsai. 2011. "Hopelessness, Family Stress, and Depression among Mexican-Heritage Mothers in the Southwest." *Health & social work*.
- Masferrer, Claudia, and Bryan R. Roberts. 2012. "Going Back Home? Changing Demography and Geography of Mexican Return Migration." *Population Research and Policy Review* 31(4):465–96. Retrieved September 26, 2014 (<http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11113-012-9243-8>).
- Massey, Douglas S. 1990. "Social Structure, Household Strategies, and the Cumulative Causation of Migration." *Population index* 56(1):3–26. Retrieved December 20, 2014 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3644186>).
- Massey, Douglas S., Rafael Alarcon, and Jorge Durand. 1987. *Return to Aztlan: The Social Process of International Migration from Western Mexico*. University of California Press.
- Massey, Douglas S., and Katherine Bartley. 2005. "The Changing Legal Status Distribution of Immigrants: A Caution." *International Migration Review* 39(2):469–84. Retrieved December 11, 2014 (<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2005.tb00274.x/abstract>).
- Massey, Douglas S., Jorge Durand, and Karen Pren. 2014. "Border Enforcement and Return Migration by Documented and Undocumented Mexicans." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 1–26.
- Matt. 2013. *The US/Mexico Cycle END of AN ERA*. San Antonio.

- McConnell, Eileen Diaz. 2013. "Erratum to: Who Has Housing Affordability Problems? Disparities in Housing Cost Burden by Race, Nativity and Legal Status in Los Angeles." *Race and Social Problems* 5(3):191–97. Retrieved December 17, 2014 (<http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s12552-013-9101-2>).
- McConnell, Eileen Diaz, and Ilana Redstone Akresh. 2009. "Housing Cost Burden and New Lawful Immigrants in the United States." *Population Research and Policy Review* 29(2):143–71. Retrieved December 16, 2014 (<http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11113-009-9134-9>).
- McMillan, David W., and David M. Chavis. 1986. "Sense of Community: A Definition and Theory." *Journal of Community Psychology* 14(January):6–23. Retrieved March 17, 2013 (<http://communities.autodesk.com/india/sites/default/files/secure/docs/McMillanChavis---psychological-Sense-of-community.pdf>).
- Medina, Dulce. 2011. "Return Migration: Modes of Incorporation for Mixed Nativity Households in Mexico." Arizona State University. Retrieved December 13, 2012 (http://129.219.247.59/attachments/56842/content/Medina_asu_0010N_10810.pdf).
- Medina, Dulce, and Cecilia Menjívar. 2015. "The Context of Return Migration : Challenges of Mixed-Status Families in Mexico's Schools." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* (June):37–41.
- Menjívar, Cecilia. 1997. "Immigrant Kinship Networks and the Impact of the Receiving Context: Salvadorans in San Francisco in the Early 1990s." *Social Problems* 44(1):104–23. Retrieved December 20, 2014 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3096876>).
- Menjívar, Cecilia. 2000. *Fragmented Ties: Salvadorian Immigrant Networks in America*. Berkeley and Los Angeles; London; New York: University of California Press.
- Menjívar, Cecilia. 2006. "Liminal Legality: Salvadoran and Guatemalan Immigrants' Lives in the United States." *American Journal of Sociology* 111:999–1037.
- Menjívar, Cecilia. 2011. "The Power of the Law: Central Americans' Legality and Everyday Life in Phoenix, Arizona." *Latino Studies* 9(4):377–95.
- Menjívar, Cecilia. 2013. "Central American Immigrant Workers and Legal Violence in Phoenix, Arizona." *Latino Studies* 11(2):228–52. Retrieved (<http://www.palgrave-journals.com/doi/10.1057/lst.2013.6>).
- Menjívar, Cecilia, and Leisy Abrego. 2009. "Parents and Children across Borders Legal Instability and Intergenerational Relations in Guatemalan and Salvadoran Families." Pp. 160–89 in *Across Generations Immigrant Families in America*, edited by Nancy Foner.

- Menjívar, Cecilia, and Daniel Kanstroom. 2014. *Constructing Immigrant "Illegality": Critiques, Experiences and Responses*. Cambridge University Press.
- Menken, Kate, Tatyana Kleyn, and Nabin Chae. 2012. "Spotlight on 'Long-Term English Language Learners': Characteristics and Prior Schooling Experiences of an Invisible Population." *International Multilingual Research Journal* 6(December 2014):121–42.
- MIPEX. 2014. "MIPEX." Retrieved March 12, 2015 (<http://www.mipex.eu/>).
- Molina, YA. 2009. "Identidades de Retorno: La Experiencia Migratoria Y Su Integración En El Lugar de Retorno." *lasa.international.pitt.edu*. Retrieved December 13, 2012 (<https://lasa.international.pitt.edu/members/congress-papers/lasa2009/files/AznarYesica.pdf>).
- Moran-Taylor, Michelle, and Cecilia Menjívar. 2005. *Unpacking Longings to Return: Guatemalans and Salvadorans in Phoenix, Arizona*. Malden.
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2015. *The Integration of Immigrants into American Society*. edited by Committee on Population.
- Nee, Victor, and Jimmy Sanders. 2010. "Understanding the Diversity of Immigrant Incorporation: A Forms-of-Capital Model." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24(3):386–411. Retrieved October 16, 2014 (<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01419870020036710>).
- Negi, Nalini Junko. 2013. "Battling Discrimination and Social Isolation: Psychological Distress among Latino Day Laborers." *American journal of community psychology* 51(1-2):164–74. Retrieved December 8, 2014 (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22864958>).
- Ní Laoire, Caitríona. 2007. "The 'green Green Grass of Home'? Return Migration to Rural Ireland." *Journal of Rural Studies* 23(3):332–44. Retrieved December 13, 2012 (<http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0743016707000083>).
- Niessen, Jan. 2013. "The MIPEX Assessment of the Republic of Korea 'S Immigrant Integration Policies." 4(2):1–26.
- Ong, Aihwa et al. 1996. "Cultural Citizenship as Subject-Making: Immigrants Negotiate Racial and Cultural Boundaries in the United States." *Current Anthropology* 37(5):737–62.
- Páez, Mariela M., Patton O. Tabors, and Lisa M. López. 2007. "Dual Language and Literacy Development of Spanish-Speaking Preschool Children." *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 28(2):85–102. Retrieved (<http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=2854405&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract>).

- Palloni, Alberto, and Elizabeth Arias. 2013. "The Hispanic Adult Paradox Lost: Explaining Mortality Advantage." *Demography* 41(3):385–415.
- Park, R. E., and E. W. Burgess. 1921. *Introduction to The Science of Sociology*. 3rd ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Park, RE. 1928. "Human Migration and the Marginal Man." *American journal of sociology* 33(6):881–93. Retrieved January 6, 2015 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2765982>).
- Passel, Jeffrey, D’Vera Cohn, and Ana Gonzalez-Barrera. 2012. *Net Migration from Mexico Falls to Zero — and Perhaps Less*. Retrieved August 15, 2013 (http://qqq-zzz.com/system/files/Pew--Net_Migration_from_Mexico_Falls_to_Zero.pdf).
- Peek, M. K., J. P. Stimpson, a. L. Townsend, and K. S. Markides. 2006. "Well-Being in Older Mexican American Spouses." *The Gerontologist* 46(2):258–65. Retrieved (<http://gerontologist.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/doi/10.1093/geront/46.2.258>).
- Perlmann, Joel, and Roger Waldinger. 1997. "Second Generation Decline? Children of Immigrants, Past and Present-a Reconsideration." *International migration review* 31(4):893–922. Retrieved April 12, 2014 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2547418>).
- Pessar, Patricia R. 1997. *New Approaches to Caribbean Emigration and Return*. 1st ed. edited by Patricia R. Pessar. New York, NY: Center for Migration Studies.
- Pew Research Center. 2015. *More Mexicans Leaving Than Coming to the U.S*. Retrieved (<http://www.pewhispanic.org/2015/11/19/more-mexicans-leaving-than-coming-to-the-u-s/>).
- Portes, Alejandro. 1997. "Immigration Theory for a New Century: Some Problems and Opportunities." *International migration review* 31(4):799–825. Retrieved April 12, 2014 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2547415>).
- Portes, Alejandro, and József Böröcz. 1989. "Contemporary Immigration: Theoretical Perspectives on Its Determinants and Modes of Incorporation." *International Migration Review* 23(3):606–30. Retrieved December 16, 2014 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2546431>).
- Portes, Alejandro, and Ruben G. Rumbaut. 1990. *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. Los Angeles: Univ of California Press.
- Portes, Alejandro, and Ruben G. Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Second Generation*. Berkeley and Los Angeles; London; New York: University of California Press.

- Portes, Alejandro, and Min Zhou. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants" edited by Norman R Yetman. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530(1):74–96. Retrieved October 30, 2012 (<http://ann.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/0002716293530001006>).
- Quiroga, S. S. n.d. "Finding a Way to Get by: Latino Household Economic Strategies in a Time of Economic and Political Strain."
- Quiroga, S. S., D. M. Medina, and J. Glick. 2014. "In the Belly of the Beast: Effects of Anti-Immigration Policy on Latino Community Members." *American Behavioral Scientist*. Retrieved June 10, 2014 (<http://abs.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/0002764214537270>).
- Randy Capps, Randy, Rosa Maria Castañeda, Ajay Chaudry, and Robert Santos. 2007. "Paying the Price: The Impact of Immigration Raids on America's Children." *National Council of La Raza A Report by The Urban Institute* 100. Retrieved (<http://www.urban.org/publications/411566.html>).
- Rendall, Michael S., Peter Brownell, and Sarah Kups. 2011. "Declining Return Migration from the United States to Mexico in the Late-2000s Recession: A Research Note." *Demography* 48(3):1049–58. Retrieved (<http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3381500&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract>).
- Reyes, BI. 1997. *Dynamics of Immigration: Return Migration to Western Mexico*. Retrieved June 20, 2014 (<http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=XmI0Qm5CSZ4C&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=Dynamics+of+Immigration+:+Return+Migration+to+Western+Mexico&ots=2wUvtOz8At&sig=qUcPzhLHSYuEABcQU9h4ZiE5pMQ>).
- Reynolds, Tracey. 2011. "Transnational Family Relationships, Social Networks and Return Migration among British-Caribbean Young People." P. 145 in *Young People, Social Capital and Ethnic Identity*.
- Romero, Mary. 2013. "The Inclusion of Citizenship Status in Intersectionality: What Immigration Raids Tells Us About Mixed-Status Families, The State and Assimilation." *International Journal of Sociology of the Family*.
- Rosaldo, Renato. 1994. "Cultural Citizenship and Educational Democracy." *Cultural Anthropology* 9(3):402–11.
- Rosaldo, Renato. 1997. "Cultural Citizenship, Inequality, and Multiculturalism." *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming identity, space, and rights* 27–38.
- Rowland, Donald. 2011. *Demographic Methods and Concepts*. edited by Oxford University Press.

- Rumbaut, RG. 2004. "Ages, Life Stages, and Generational Cohorts: Decomposing the Immigrant First and Second Generations in the United States." *International Migration Review* 38(3):1160–1205. Retrieved April 12, 2014 (<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2004.tb00232.x/abstract>).
- Sabatier, Colette. 2008. "Ethnic and National Identity among Second-Generation Immigrant Adolescents in France: The Role of Social Context and Family." *Journal of Adolescence* 31(2):185–205.
- Safi, M. 2009. "Immigrants' Life Satisfaction in Europe: Between Assimilation and Discrimination." *European Sociological Review* 26(2):159–76. Retrieved September 16, 2014 (<http://esr.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/doi/10.1093/esr/jcp013>).
- Sánchez, Raúl. 2008. "Modes of Incorporation , Social Exclusion , and Transnationalism : ..."
- Santos, Carlos E., and Cecilia Menjivar. 2014. "Youths ' Perspective on Senate Bill 1070 in Arizona : The Socio-Emotional Effects of Immigration Policy." *Association of Mexican American Educators Journal* 7(2):7–17.
- Schildkraut, Deborah J. 2005. "The Rise and Fall of Political Engagement among Latinos: The Role of Identity and Perceptions of Discrimination." *Political Behavior* 27(3):285–312.
- Schwartz, Seth J. et al. 2014. "Perceived Context of Reception among Recent Hispanic Immigrants: Conceptualization, Instrument Development, and Preliminary Validation." *Cultural diversity & ethnic minority psychology* 20(1):1–15. Retrieved (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24099485>).
- Schwartz, Seth J., Jennifer B. Unger, Byron L. Zamboanga, and José Szapocznik. 2010. "Rethinking the Concept of Acculturation: Implications for Theory and Research." *The American psychologist* 65(4):237–51. Retrieved August 6, 2013 (<http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3700543&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract>).
- Şenyürekli, Aysem R., and Cecilia Menjívar. 2012. "Turkish Immigrants' Hopes and Fears around Return Migration." *International Migration* 50(1):3–19. Retrieved April 11, 2014 (<http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1468-2435.2011.00723.x>).
- Simonsen, Kristina Bakker. 2015. "How the Host Nation's Boundary Drawing Affects Immigrants' Belonging." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*.
- Staton, Jeffrey K., Robert a. Jackson, and Damarys Canache. 2007. "Dual Nationality among Latinos: What Are the Implications for Political Connectedness." *Journal of Politics* 69(2):470–82.

- Suárez-Orozco, Carola, Hirokazu Yoshikawa, Robert Teranishi, and Marcelo M. Suárez-Orozco. 2011. "Growing Up in the Shadows: The Developmental Implications of Unauthorized Status." *Harvard Educational Review* 81(3):438–73.
- Tajfel, Henri. 1981. *Human Groups and Social Categories*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, Michelle J. Moran. 2001. "Redalyc.Nostalgia Por La Tierra, Nostalgia Por El Dolar: Guatemalan Transnational Lives and Ideology of Return Migration." *Estudios Fronterizos* 2(4):93–114.
- Taylor, Paul, Mark Hugo Lopez, Jeffrey Passel, and Seth Motel. 2011. *Unauthorized Immigrants : Length of Residency, Patterns of Parenthood*. Washington, DC. Retrieved (<http://www.pewhispanic.org/files/2011/12/Unauthorized-Characteristics.pdf>).
- Telles, Edwiar, and Vilma Ortiz. 2011. "State of the Discourse and the Mexican American Experience: Racialization in Ascendance." 2:497–503.
- Telles, EE, and V. Ortiz. 2008. "Generations of Exclusion." *New York: Russell Sage Foundation*. Retrieved April 12, 2014 (http://csii.usc.edu/presentations/Ortiz_Presentation6_USC.pdf).
- Theiss-Morse, Elizabeth. 2009. *Review: American?: The Boundaries of National*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tiemoko, Richmond. 2004. "Migration, Return and Socio-Economic Change in West Africa: The Role of Family." *Population, Space and Place* 10(2):155–74. Retrieved March 22, 2014 (<http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/psp.320>).
- Tienda, Marta, and Ron Haskins. 2011. "Immigrant Children: Introducing the Issue." *The Future of Children* 21(1):3–18. Retrieved April 12, 2014 (http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/future_of_children/v021/21.1.tienda.html).
- Tran, Van. 2012. "General Overviews." *Oxford Bibliography Online*. Retrieved (<http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199756384/obo-9780199756384-0101.xml>).
- Tsuda, T. 2003. *Strangers in the Ethnic Homeland*. Columbia University Press. Retrieved (http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=UrDyg-C_xeYC&oi=fnd&pg=PR9&dq=Strangers+in+the+Ethnic+Homeland&ots=4ptAJkn_bo&sig=jw5yQ9z8Nk-WDryDNlIyi_FdLvlg).
- Tsuda, Takeyuki. 1999. "Transnational Migration and of Ethnic the Nationalization Japanese Identity among Return Brazilian." *Ethos* 27(2):145–79.

- Tsuda, Takeyuki. 2003. *Strangers in the Ethnic Homeland: Japanese Brazilian Return Migration in Transnational Perspective*. Columbia University Press. Retrieved December 16, 2012 (http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=UrDyg-C_xeYC&pgis=1).
- Tsuda, Takeyuki. 2004. "When Home Is Not the Homeland: The Case of Japanese Brazilian Ethnic Return Migration." Pp. 125–46 in *Homecomings Unsettling Paths of Return*, edited by Fran Markowitz and Anders H. Stefansson. Maryland: Lexington Books.
- Valdez-Gardea, Gloria. 2012. "Migración Y Retorno de La Niñez Migrante. Desafíos En Las Escuelas Del Noroeste de México." in *Migracion Internacional Algunos Desafios*. Retrieved December 16, 2012 (<http://www.scribd.com/doc/109732740/Migracion-y-retorno-de-la-ninez-migrante-Desafios-en-las-escuelas-del-noroeste-de-Mexico>).
- Valdivia, Corinne et al. 2008. "The Impact of Networks and the Context of Reception on Asset Accumulation Strategies of Latino Newcomers in New Settlement Communities of the Midwest." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 90(5):1319–25. Retrieved August 15, 2013 (<http://ajae.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8276.2008.01224.x>).
- Valle, Eunice Vargas. 2012. "Youth and Education in the Mexican Northern Border Region: A Decade of Change." Phoenix.
- Valle, Eunice Vargas. 2015. "Switching Schools? School Enrollment & Age-Grade Gaps of Recent Migrants from the US to Mexico." in *New Patterns of Mexican Migration to the United States: Perspectives from the Border*. Los Angeles, CA: COLEF.
- Williams, David R., Selina a Mohammed, Jacinta Leavell, and Chiquita Collins. 2010. "Race, Socioeconomic Status, and Health: Complexities, Ongoing Challenges, and Research Opportunities." *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1186:69–101. Retrieved December 13, 2014 (<http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3442603&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract>).
- Yoshikawa, Hirokazu. 2011. *Immigrants Raising Citizens: Undocumented Parents and Their Children*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Zhou, Min. 1997. "Segmented Assimilation: Issues, Controversies, and Recent Research on the New Second Generation." *International migration review* 31(4):975–1008. Retrieved April 12, 2014 (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2547421>).
- Zúñiga, Victor, and Edmund T. Hamann. 2009. "Sojourners in Mexico with U.S. School Experience: A New Taxonomy for Transnational Students." *Comparative Education Review* 53(3):329–53. Retrieved (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/599356>).

- Zúñiga, Víctor, and Edmund T. Hamann. 2014. "Going to a Home You Have Never Been to: The Return Migration of Mexican and American-Mexican Children." *Children's Geographies* (July 2014):1–13. Retrieved July 30, 2014 (<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14733285.2014.936364>).
- Zúñiga, Víctor, and ET Hamann. 2006. "Going Home? Schooling in Mexico of Transnational Children." *CONfines de relaciones internacionales* ... 41–57. Retrieved December 16, 2012 (<http://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=2147140>).

APPENDIX A

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD FORMS



Office of Research Integrity and Assurance

To: Cecilia Menjivar
SS

From: Mark Roosa, Chair *SM*
Soc Beh IRB

Date: 06/28/2010

Committee Action: Expedited Approval

Approval Date: 06/28/2010

Review Type: Expedited F7

IRB Protocol #: 1006005251

Study Title: The Return Migration Experience: Mexican Migrants and Their U.S. Born Children

Expiration Date: 06/27/2011

The above-referenced protocol was approved following expedited review by the Institutional Review Board.

It is the Principal Investigator's responsibility to obtain review and continued approval before the expiration date. You may not continue any research activity beyond the expiration date without approval by the Institutional Review Board.

Adverse Reactions: If any untoward incidents or severe reactions should develop as a result of this study, you are required to notify the Soc Beh IRB immediately. If necessary a member of the IRB will be assigned to look into the matter. If the problem is serious, approval may be withdrawn pending IRB review.

Amendments: If you wish to change any aspect of this study, such as the procedures, the consent forms, or the investigators, please communicate your requested changes to the Soc Beh IRB. The new procedure is not to be initiated until the IRB approval has been given.

Please retain a copy of this letter with your approved protocol.

INFORMATION LETTER-INTERVIEWS

The Return Migration Experience: Mexican Migrants and Their U.S. Born Children

6/21/2010

Dear _____:

I am a graduate student under the direction of Professor Dr. Cecilia Menjivar in the Department of Sociology at Arizona State University. I am conducting a research study to explore how your household is (re)settling in Malinalco after living in the United States, how your children are coping with the move, and how the Malinalco community is receiving you.

I am inviting your participation, which will involve 60-120 minutes at your home or at your preferred site location. You will be asked to answer some basic demographic questions, about your migration experience, how the community is receiving your family, how you identify, and about the education systems.

You have the right not to answer any question, and to stop the interview at any time.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty. You must be 18 or older to participate in the study.

Although there may be no direct benefits to you, the possible benefits of your participation in the research are possible migrant resources to the community and a better understanding of the migration experience and movement. There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts to your participation.

Your responses will be confidential. The results of this study may be used in reports, presentations, or publications but your name will not be known.

In order to maintain confidentiality of your records, Dr. Cecilia Menjivar will not use names of the people in the study and will change street names, password protect all files, and all tangible objects (documents, recorders) will be locked in a secure location at the researchers home in Malinalco, Mexico. Only the researcher will have access to the documents and files. Files will be shredded and electronic files deleted upon completion of Dulce Medina's thesis (tentatively 5/2011).

I would like to audiotape this interview. The interview will not be recorded without your permission. Please let me know if you do not want the interview to be taped; you also can change your mind after the interview starts, just let me know. Audio files will be locked in a secure location at the researcher's home in Malinalco, Mexico. Only the researcher

ASU IRB Approved	
Sign	SM
Date	6/28/10 - 6/21/11

will have access to the recorders and audio files. Files will be shredded and electronic files deleted upon completion of Dulce Medina's thesis (tentatively 5/2011).

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please contact the research team at:

Principal Investigator
Dr. Cecilia Menjivar
P.O. Box 873701
Tempe, AZ 85287-3701
(480) 727-0863

Co-Investigator
Dulce Medina
P.O. Box 873701
Tempe, AZ 85287-3701
(916) 599-7200

If you have any questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, through the ASU Office of Research Integrity and Assurance, at (480) 965-6788. Please let me know if you wish to be part of the study.

CARTA DE INFORMACION – ENTREVISTAS

La experiencia de la migración de retorno: Los migrantes mexicanos y sus hijos nacidos en EE.UU.

21 de Junio del 2010

Estimado _____:

Soy un estudiante de postgrado bajo la dirección de la profesora Cecilia Menjivar en el Departamento de Sociología de la Universidad Estatal de Arizona. Estoy llevando a cabo un estudio de investigación para explorar como se está acoplando en Malinalco después de vivir en los EE.UU., como sus hijos están arreglándose con la mudanza, y como la comunidad de Malinalco los recibe.

Estoy invitando su participación, lo que supondrá aproximadamente 1 hora – 1 ½ horas en su casa o. La participación de su hijo en este estudio es voluntaria. Si decide no tener a en su localización de su preferencia. Se le preguntara varias preguntas de demografía, de su experiencia migratoria, y de los sistemas de la educación.

Tiene el derecho de preguntar cualquier pregunta, y de parar la entrevista a cualquier momento.

Su participación en este estudio es voluntario. Si usted decide no participar o salir del estudio en cualquier momento, no habrá penalización. Tiene que tener 18 años o más para participar en este estudio.

Aunque no haya ningún beneficio directo para Ud., el posible beneficio de la participación serán servicios a la comunidad y un buen entendimiento de la experiencia migratoria y movimiento. No prever ningún riesgo o molestia de su participación.

Las respuestas serán confidenciales. Los resultados de este estudio pueden ser utilizados en los informes, presentaciones, publicaciones o menos en el nombre no será utilizada.

Para mantener la confidencia de sus datos, Dr. Cecilia Menjivar no usara los nombres de las personas en el estudio y cambiara los nombres de calles, protegeremos con contraseña todos los archivos, y todos los objetos materiales (documentos, grabadoras) se bloquearán en una ubicación segura en la casa de los investigadores en Malinalco, México. Solo el investigador tendrá acceso a los documentos y archivos. Los archivos y archivos electrónicos serán eliminados al terminar mi tesis (en principio 5 / 2011).

ASU IRB Approved	
Sign	SM
Date	6/28/10 - 6/27/11

Me gustara grabar esta entrevista. La entrevista no será grabada sin su permiso. Por favor de dejarme saber si no quiere la entrevista que sea grabada.; también puede cambiar su mente después de que la entrevista empiece, nada más dejarme saber. Los archivos de audio serán bloqueados en una parte segura en la casa de la investigadora en Malinalco, Mexico. Solamente la investigadora tendrá acceso a las grabadoras y archivos de audio. . Los archivos y archivos electrónicos serán eliminados al terminar mi tesis (en principio 5 / 2011).

Si usted tiene alguna pregunta relacionada con el estudio de investigación o la participación de su hijo en este estudio, por favor llamen el equipo de investigación al:

Investigadora Principal
Dr. Cecilia Menjivar
P.O. Box 873701
Tempe, AZ 85287-3701
(480) 727-0863

Co-Investigadora
Dulce Medina
P.O. Box 873701
Tempe, AZ 85287-3701
(916) 599-7200

Si usted tiene alguna pregunta acerca de usted o de los derechos del niño como sujeto / participante en esta investigación o si usted cree que usted o su hijo han sido puestos en riesgo, usted puede comunicarse con el Presidente de la Sujetos Humanos de Junta de Revisión Institucional, a través de la Oficina Integridad de la Investigación y Aseguramiento, al (480) 965-6.788.

ASSENT FORM

The Return Migration Experience: Mexican Migrants and Their U.S. Born Children

My name is Dulce Medina. I study at Arizona State University.

I am asking you to take part in a research study because I am trying to learn more about the children born in the U.S. and now live here. I want to learn about when you moved, about your school, your community and about you. Your parent(s)/guardian have given you permission to participate in this study.

If you agree, you will be asked to answer some questions. You will be asked about your big move, how you like or dislike where you live now, how school is, and asked to tell me about yourself. Answering these questions will take about an hour. You do not have to write anything. You do not have to answer any questions that make you uncomfortable.

You do not have to be in this study. No one will be mad at you if you decide not to do this study. Even if you start the study, you can stop later if you want. You may ask questions about the study at any time.

If you decide to be in the study I will not tell anyone else how you respond or act as part of the study. Even if your parents or teachers ask, I will not tell them about what you say or do in the study.

Please let me know if you wish to be part of the study. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Signature of investigator _____

Date _____

ASU IRB Approved	
Sign	sm
Date	6-28-10 - 6-27-11

FORMA DE ASENTIMIENTO

La experiencia de la migración de retorno: Los migrantes mexicanos y sus hijos nacidos en EE.UU.

Mi nombre es Dulce Medina. Yo estudio en la Universidad Estatal de Arizona.

Le pido que participe en un estudio de investigación porque estoy tratando de aprender más acerca de los niños nacidos en los EE.UU. y que ahora vivan aquí. Yo quiero aprender acerca de cuándo se mudó, acerca de su escuela, su comunidad y sobre usted. Su padre (s) o tutor le han dado permiso para participar en este estudio.

Si está de acuerdo, se le pedirá responder a algunas preguntas. Se le preguntará acerca de su gran movimiento, como le gusta o no les gusta donde viven ahora, ¿cómo es la escuela, y pediré que me cuente sobre si mismo. Responder a estas preguntas tomará alrededor de una hora. Usted no tiene que escribir nada. Usted no tiene que responder a cualquier pregunta que no le guste.

Usted no tiene que participar en este estudio. Nadie se va a enojar con usted si no decide hacer este estudio. Incluso si se inicia el estudio, puede detener más tarde si lo desea. Usted puede hacer preguntas sobre el estudio en cualquier momento.

Si usted decide participar en el estudio no voy a decirle a nadie cómo responde o actúa como parte del estudio. Incluso si sus padres o maestros les piden, no voy a hablarles de lo que usted diga o haga en el estudio.

Favor de dejarme saber si desea ser parte del estudio. Por favor dejar me saber si tiene cualquier pregunta.

Firma del investigador _____

Fecha _____

ASU IRB Approved	
Sign	sm
Date	6/28/10 - 6/21/11

PARENTAL LETTER OF PERMISSION
The Return Migration Experience: Mexican Migrants and Their U.S. Born Children

Dear Parent:

I am a graduate student under the direction of Professor Cecilia Menjivar in the Department of Sociology at Arizona State University. I am conducting a research study to the (re)settlement experiences of families that have returned to Mexico with their U.S. born school age children. This study focuses on migration, community reception, identity, and education.

I am inviting your child's participation, which will involve approximately 1 hour. Your child's participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to have your child participate or to withdraw your child from the study at any time, there will be no penalty. Likewise, if your child chooses not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty. The results of the research study may be published, but your child's name will not be used.

Although there may be no direct benefit to your child, the possible benefit of your child's participation is increased services for U.S. born children like your child. There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts to your child's participation.

To ensure confidentiality, names of the people in the study will not be used, street names and other identifiers will be removed, all electronic files will be password protected, and all tangible objects (documents, recorders) will be locked in a secure location at the researcher's home in Malinalco, Mexico. Only the researcher will have access to the documents and files. Files will be shredded and electronic files deleted upon completion of my thesis (tentatively 5/2011). Responses will be confidential. The results of this study may be used in reports, presentations, or publications but your child's name will not be used.

If you have any questions concerning the research study or your child's participation in this study, please call me at (916) 599-7200.

Sincerely,

Dulce Medina

ASU IRB Approved	
Sign	<u>SM</u>
Date	<u>6/8/10 - 6/27/11</u>

By signing below, you are giving consent for your child _____
(Child's name) to participate in the above study.

Signature

Printed Name

Date

If you have any questions about you or your child's rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you or your child have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, through the Office of Research Integrity and Assurance, at (480) 965-6788.

CARTA DE PERMISO DE LOS PADRES

La experiencia de la migración de retorno: Los migrantes mexicanos y sus hijos nacidos en EE.UU.

Estimados padres:

Soy un estudiante de postgrado bajo la dirección de la profesora Cecilia Menjivar en el Departamento de Sociología de la Universidad Estatal de Arizona. Estoy llevando a cabo un estudio de investigación para la (re) estableción de las experiencias de familias que han regresado a México con sus hijos nacidos en EE.UU. en edad escolar. Este estudio se centra en la migración, la recepción de la comunidad, la identidad y la educación.

Estoy invitando la participación de su hijo/a, lo que supondrá aproximadamente 1 hora. La participación de su hijo en este estudio es voluntaria. Si decide no tener a su hijo participar o retirar a su hijo a partir del estudio en cualquier momento, no habrá penalización. Del mismo modo, si su hijo decide no participar o retirarse del estudio en cualquier momento, no habrá penalización. Los resultados del estudio de investigación puede ser publicado, pero el nombre de su hijo no será utilizada.

Aunque no haya ningún beneficio directo para su hijo, el posible beneficio de la participación de su hijo es mayor para los servicios de nacidos en los EE.UU. los niños como su hijo. No existen riesgos previsibles o molestias a la participación de su hijo.

Para garantizar la confidencialidad, cambiaremos los nombres de las personas en el estudio, cambiaremos el nombre de la calle, protegeremos con contraseña todos los archivos, y todos los objetos materiales (documentos, grabadoras) se bloquearán en una ubicación segura en la casa de los investigadores en Malinalco, México. Solo el investigador tendrá acceso a los documentos y archivos. Los archivos y archivos electrónicos serán eliminados al terminar mi tesis (en principio 5 / 2011). Las respuestas serán confidenciales. Los resultados de este estudio pueden ser utilizados en los informes, presentaciones, publicaciones o menos en el nombre de su hijo no será utilizada.

Si usted tiene alguna pregunta relacionada con el estudio de investigación o la participación de su hijo en este estudio, por favor llámeme al (916) 599-7200.

Atentamente,

Dulce Medina

ASU IRB Approved	
Sign	<i>SM</i>
Date	6/26/10 - 6/27/11

Al firmar abajo, usted está dando consentimiento para que su niño
_____ (Nombre del niño) a participar en el estudio anterior.

Firmar

Imprimir Nombre

Fecha

Si usted tiene alguna pregunta acerca de usted o de los derechos del niño como sujeto / participante en esta investigación o si usted cree que usted o su hijo han sido puestos en riesgo, usted puede comunicarse con el Presidente de la Sujetos Humanos de Junta de Revisión Institucional, a través de la Oficina Integridad de la Investigación y Aseguramiento, al (480) 965-6.788.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

My personal history as an immigrant makes the subject of integration a particular topic of interest to me. I was born in central Mexico and migrated to the U.S. at the age of three. Although my family and I migrated legally with U.S. visas, it took us eight years to regulate our status after overstaying our tourist visa and qualify for amnesty under The Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA). During those eight years, I, along with my siblings and mother, were undocumented. Thus, I know firsthand what it means to be in the U.S. without legal authorization, without being able to visit my birthplace, and to know multiple family members and friends who lack proper legal status. Cognizant of my “papers privilege,” I am well aware that a legal document is what separates me from others with the same birthplace. In fact, I would have qualified for so-called “Deferred Action,” as I was brought to the U.S. as a child “through no fault of my own,” attended school, and met all of the other current requirements. Now as a naturalized U.S. citizen, I am very aware of having the luxury of carrying a blue, United States passport, the advantage of qualifying for federal student loans, having the right to vote, among many other benefits. Given my background, my experiences lend me the ability to ask appropriate questions of respondents and to extract rich answers related to the integration questions based, in part, on what I have personally experienced and observed, both in my own life and of those around me.